222.d.3.
6.

A Brief

EXAMINATION

Of the preſent

Roman Catholick Faith;

Contained in

Pope PIUS

HIS

New Creed,

BY

The Scriptures, Antient Fathers and their own Modern Writers, in Anſwer to a Letter, deſiring ſatisfaction concerning the Viſibility of the Proteſtant Church and Religion in all Ages, eſpecially before *Luther*'s time.

Imprimatur.

Octob. 26. 1688. *Guil. Needham.*

London, Printed for *James Adamſon*, at the Angel and Crown in St. *Pauls* Church-yard. 1689.

Pope *Pius* his CREED,

OR THE

Profeſſion of the *Roman* Catholick Faith.

THAT *the Profeſſion of one and the ſame Faith may be uniformly exhibited to all, and its certain form may be known to all; we have cauſed it to be publiſhed, ſtrictly commanding that the Profeſſion of Faith be made after this form and no other.* I N. *do with firm Faith believe and profeſs all and ſingular things contained in the Creeds (to wit,* Nicene, &c.) *which the* Roman *Church uſeth; namely, I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things viſible and inviſible,* &c. *The Apoſtolick and Eccleſiaſtical Traditions and other obſervances and Conſtitutions of that Church I firmly admit and embrace.—— I do alſo confeſs, that there be truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new Law inſtituted by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,* Extreme Unction, Orders, Marriage, &c. *And that they confer Grace. All things which concerning Original Sin and Juſtification were defined in the* 4th *Council of* Trent *I embrace and receive. Alſo I confeſs, that in the Maſs is offered to God a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead; and that in the Holy Euchariſt is truly, really and ſubſtantially the body and bloud of our Lord, and that there is made a converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Bread into his Body, and of*

V. Bullam Pii 4. ſuper forma profeſſionis fidei, ſub finem Concilii Tridentini.

the Wine into his Bloud, which converſion the Catholick Church calleth Tranſubſtantiation. *I confeſs alſo, that under one kind onely all and whole Chriſt, and the true Sacrament is received. I do conſtantly hold there is a Purgatory, and the Souls detained there are helped by the ſuffrages of the Faithful. And likewiſe, that the Saints reigning with Chriſt, are to be worſhipped and prayed to —— and that their Reliques are to be worſhipped. And moſt firmly I avouch, that the Images of Chriſt and the Mother of God and other Saints, are to be had and retained, and that to them due honour and veneration is to be given. Alſo, that the power of Indulgences was left by Chriſt in the Church; and I affirm the uſe thereof to be moſt wholeſome to Chriſts people. That the Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick* Roman *Church is the Mother and Miſtris of all Churches. I acknowledge, and I vow and ſwear true obedience to the Biſhop of* Rome, *the Succeſſour of St.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apoſtles, and the Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt. And all other things likewiſe do I undoubtingly receive and confeſs which are delivered, defined and declared by the ſacred Canons and General Councils; and eſpecially the Holy Council of* Trent. *And withal, I condemn and accurſe all things that are contrary hereunto, ----- and that I will be careful this true Catholick Faith, out of the which no man can be ſaved, which at this time I willingly profeſs, be conſtantly (with Gods help) retained and confeſſed whole and inviolate to the laſt gaſp, and by thoſe that are under me ---- holden, taught and preached to the uttermoſt of my power, I the ſaid* N. *promiſe, vow and ſwear.* So God me help, and his Holy Goſpels.

After

A Brief
EXAMINATION
OF THE
Preſent Roman Catholick Faith, &c.

SIR,

I Received your Letter, wherein you deſire I would give you ſatisfaction *concerning the Viſibility* of the Proteſtant Religion and Church in the Ages before *Luther*. In order thereunto, I ſend you theſe Lines, requeſting you, as you love and value the ſafety of your own Soul, laying aſide the blind belief of the Roman Infallibility, (which renders all Diſcourſing or Writing vain and unprofitable) to read them ſeriouſly and impartially. You begin thus: "I find your "Divines aſſerting that the Church hath been hidden and in- "viſible.

I.

How Proteſtant Writers are to be underſtood when they argue againſt the perpetual Viſibility of the Church.

To which I anſwer; That the Church hath been for ſome time hidden, *i. e.* obſcured; ſo that it was not conſpicuous or eaſily diſcernable by all Chriſtians, much leſs Heathens, is a truth ſo manifeſt, that our Adverſaries themſelves grant it; as I ſhall ſhew afterward. That the Catholick Church was ever wholly rooted out by Hereſie or Perſecution; or that in any Age all outward profeſſion of the Truth, though ſometime more ſecret and private, was wholly hidden and utterly inviſible in the eyes of all men, we affirm not. Cardinal *Bellarmine* himſelf notes, that many of his Church have taken much needleſs pains in proving againſt us the perpetuity and indefectibility of the Church, which as he confeſſes, we never denied: We only ſay that any particular Church, even that of *Rome*, may utterly fail. But you add, "I find "your Divines ſaying otherwiſe, for Biſhop *Juel*, Apol. p. 7. "writeth,

Multi ex noſtris tempus terunt dum probant Eccleſiam non poſſe abſolutè deficere; nam Hæretici id concedunt. De Eccleſ. Militan. lib. 3. cap. 13.

" writeth, That *Luther*'s preaching was the very first appear-
" ing of the Gospel. And pag. 8. That Forty years and
" upward, *i. e.* at the first setting forth of *Luther* and *Zuin-*
" *glius*, the truth was unknown and unheard of; and that
" they came first to the knowledg and preaching of the Gos-
" pel. Let Bishop *Juel* answer for himself. Defence of the
Apol. pag. 82. " Ye say we confess our Church began only
" about Forty years since. No, Mr. *Harding*, we confess it
" not, and you your self well know we confess it not. Our
" Doctrine is the Old, and yours is the New. We say our
" Doctrine and the order of our Churches, is older than yours
" by Five hundred years. And he not only saith it, but un-
answerably proves it by the Testimonies of the Ancient Fa-
thers. Hence that Book is appointed to be had in all our
Churches; so great a respect have we for Primitive Anti-
quity; and so far are we from imagining the Gospel or the
Truth we profess to be no older than *Luther* or *Zuinglius*.

Pag. 355,356. But Mr. *White* in his Defence of the Way to the Church,
saith, Popery was such a Leprosie spreading so universally
over the Church, that there was no visible Company of Peo-
ple appearing to the World (*viz.* in the Ages next before
Luther) free from it. True, he saith so, but he explains his
meaning in the same place; for he acknowledgeth the
Churches of *Greece*, *Æthiopia*, *Armenia*, to have been and
still to be true visible Christian Churches; yea, that the
Church of *Rome* is a part of the Visible Church of God, where-
in our Ancestors possessed the true Faith, as to the Funda-
mental Articles necessary to Salvation, and were some of
them saved: So that he acknowledgeth in some sense, the
Visibility of the Church, even *Roman*; which Protestants
deny not; who grant that the true Church was in or under
the Papacy, although the Papacy was not that Church. Nei-
ther is there any contradiction in this, for a Leper is a true
Man, and as truly Visible as one that is clean. Leprosie is
not a distinct Body, but a Disease cleaving to it. In like
manner, Popery is not of it self a distinct Church, but a
corrupt humour in latter Ages predominant in the true Vi-
sible Church of God. Nevertheless he denies first the Pa-
pacy, *i. e.* the Errors and Corruptions in Doctrine and Wor-
ship introduc'd of late by the Popes and their adherents, to

Ecclesia vera erat in Papatu, sed Papatus non erat vera Ecclesia. Alii cautius Papatum dixerunt fuisse in Ecclesiâ, non Ecclesiam in Papatu. Prideaux Lect. de Visibil. Eccl. p. 136.

be

be any part of the true antient Chriſtian Catholick Faith, by which our Anceſtors were ſaved, any more than Leproſie is any part of a Man. Secondly, he denyeth that there is alwaies and at all times in this true Viſible Church a viſible Company or State of People actually and perſonally divided from the reſt that profeſs the True Faith, perform Religious Worſhip, and exerciſe Church-Diſcipline in open and conſpicuous manner, wholly free from the Corruptions and Abuſes of ſuch as have defiled the Church. For 'tis one thing to be a True Viſible Church, another to be free from all ſuch Errors and Corruptions, as may, being wilfully perſiſted in, endanger Mens Salvation, and therefore need Reformation. The Church of the Jews was the true, yea, the only true Church of God; yet in the time of *Elijah*, and after in our Saviour's days, they were generally ten Tribes of twelve over-run with Idolatry and Superſtition. The like we ſay of the Church of *Rome* in the Ages next before *Luther*, when not only groſs Ignorance, but many palpable Errors and Corruptions in Doctrine, Worſhip, and Government, did viſibly appear, which many eminent Profeſſors, (ſufficient, as a Jeſuit confeſſeth, to prove the Churches Viſibility under Perſecution) who lived and died in the Communion of that Church, openly oppoſed, lamented and bewailed, as S. *Bernard*, *Clemangis*, *Alvarus*, *Pelagius*, *Cameracenſis*, Biſhop *Groſthead*, with innumerable more; although they were over-born by the predominant Party then bearing rule, who could not indure to hear of Reformation, tho much deſired by many true Catholicks, and promiſed by *Adrian* the Sixth, and other Popes before the calling of the Council of *Trent*. But it is very diſingenuous to quote out of any Writer a line or two, and not to add with it his explained ſenſe and meaning. *As for Mr.* Perkins, *who in his* Reformed Catholick *(which I have not now by me) ſaith, That during the ſpace of* 900 *years there was no Church Viſible beſides the Roman Catholick Church, his Words (if his) admit of the ſame Anſwer.* But I dare appeal to any Chriſtian, whether he can poſſibly believe that any learned Proteſtant Writer, yea any man in his wits, ſhould think that the Goſpel preached by our Saviour and the Apoſtles, aſſerted by the Antient Fathers and Martyrs, ſhould firſt appear in the World, when *Luther* and *Zuinglius* began

The Anſwer to D. *White*, pag. 354.

See the Articles of Reformation propoſed to the Council of *Trent*, by *Ferdinand* the Emperour, and *Charles* the Ninth. *Apud Goldaſt. conſtitut. Imp. tomo* 2. *p.* 376. and *tomo* 3. *p.* 570.

Juels Defence, pag. 45, 46.

to preach. For my part I utterly renounce that Goſpel, Faith, and Church, of which *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, or any mere mortal man, tho pretending to be Infallible, is the Author and Founder. Did not I believe the Doctrine generally own'd by the Proteſtants, to be grounded in the Scriptures and the concurrent ſenſe of the Antient Fathers, I could not ſatisfie my own Conſcience as to the profeſſion of it. The true meaning then of ſome Proteſtant Writers could be only this; That the Goſpel or Chriſtian Religion did in *Luther*'s days begin firſt to appear more eminently freed or reformed from thoſe after-grown Errors and Corruptions it was in ſome later Ages mis-figured with, being reduced to the prime Rule of Faith, the Scripture, and its beſt interpreter, Primitive Antiquity. And is it not an unſpeakable Bleſſing, that we enjoy ſuch a Reformation? For I can ſcarcely think, that any ſober Romaniſt will deny, that the firſt were the beſt, and the laſt the worſt Ages of the Church, and that there was after the Apoſtles days, and the firſt 5 or 600 years a manifeſt declenſion of the antient purity of Doctrin and ſimplicity of Devotion, altho there ſtill remained a true Church as to eſſentials.

Garenz. de Sergio de Concil. p. 706.
Aquin. 2. qu. 1. art. 7. reſp. ad 4.

II.

The Queſtion concerning the Viſibility of the Church ſtated.

BUT that we may not beat the air, I ſhall firſt of all enquire into the true ſtate of the Queſtion. Proteſtants do not, as *Bellarmine* grants, affirm the Church to be wholly and abſolutely Inviſible or utterly hid from the eyes of all men in any Age, but comparatively only, not being alwaies equally Viſible. They acknowledg that God ever had and will have a Church in the World which ſhall make in *ſome degree* a *Viſible* profeſſion of Chriſtian Religion even under Perſecution, tho not ſo illuſtrious and conſpicuous; for they ſay that the Church may be reduced to a ſmall number, the Orthodox Paſtors may be violently thruſt out of their Churches, and the beſt Chriſtians forced to worſhip God privately in corners. And will any man deny but this detracts much from the Viſibility and conſpicuouſneſs of the Church?

Thus it was in the days of *Athanaſius* and *Hilary*. See their words below.

They of the Church of *Rome* grant all this. The Jeſuit Mr. *White* anſwers, doth not avow, yea diſowns it, that *the Church is viſible*, i.e. *that it is a Company of Chriſtians ſo illuſtrious as it not only may be, but actually is known to all men living*

Defence of the Way. p. 354.

living at all times; for ſaith he, *I know well enough that the Church hath not alwaies, eſpecially in time of Perſecution, ſuch an outward worldly and proſperous eſtate. I grant alſo,* adds he, *that ſometimes the Church is obſcured, as S.* Auſtin *ſaith, with multitude of Scandals, and therefore it is not alwaies alike famous and illuſtrious, eſpecially ſo as to ſhine actually through the whole World.* I will add the Words of another learned Jeſuite, *Greg. de Valentiâ. When we ſay the Church is alway conſpicuous, this muſt not be taken as if we thought it might at all times be diſcerned alike eaſily. For we know, that ſometimes it (i. e.* the Church, the Mountain, *Iſai. 2. 2.) is ſo toſſed with the waves of Errors, Schiſms, and Perſecutions, that to ſuch as are unskilful* (as the far greater part of Chriſtians ever are) *and do not diſcreetly enough weigh circumſtances of times and things, it ſhall be very hard to be known; which then eſpecially fell out, when the falſhood of* Arrians *bare rule almoſt over all the World. Therefore we deny not, but that it will be harder to diſcern the Church at ſome time than at other ſome; yet this we avouch, that it alway might be diſcerned by ſuch as could wiſely eſteem things:* So he.

Eccleſia aliquando obſcuratur & tanquam obnubilatur multitudine ſcandalorum, &c. Epiſt. ad Vincent. 48.

Firmiores partim exulabant, partim latitabant. Ibid.

Diligenter animadverti debet non ſic accipiendum eſſe quod dicimus Eccleſiam eſſe ſemper conſpicuam, quaſi velimus eamomni tempore dignoſci poſſe æquè facilé. Novimus enim illam aliquando errorum, ſchiſmatum, perſecutionum fluctibus eſſe agitatam, ut imperitis quidem nec ſatis prudenter rationes temporum rerumque circumſtantias æſtimantibus cognitu fuerit difficilis quod tum maximè accidit cùm Arianorum perfidia in orbe pænè toto dominabatur. Analyſ. Fid. l. 6. c. 4.

And is this all they would infer from *Mat.* 5. 14, 15. *Ye are the light of the world. A City that is ſet on an hill cannot be hid,* &c. Is a Light or City on a hill only diſcernable by a few diſcreet quick-ſighted perſons? Is this the Viſibility they ſo much contend for? Well, it's here granted us, that the Church is not alway eaſily viſible or diſcernable to all, but only to a few diſcreet Perſons. If this will ſatisfie them, we ſhall readily grant, that the Proteſtant Church under the Perſecution and Errors of the Papacy was not eaſily diſcernable, yea was or is hardly viſible to ſuch as are unskilful, and do not wiſely enough weigh circumſtances of times, *viz.* of Oppreſſion and Perſecution: Yet this we ſay, that it might have been diſcern'd even in the next Ages before *Luther*, not only in the *Waldenſes*, *Wickleviſts*, *Albigenſes*, and *Bohemians*, (how odious and contemptible ſoever they are render'd to the

the ignorant and unskilful by their Adversaries) but many other eminent Professors and Writers of their own Church, by such as can discreetly judg of things and times.

What great matter then can these men make of the Visibility of the Church they so much boast of? But is all this Contention about nothing? truly it is no easie thing to resolve what it is our Adversaries would have more than is already granted by us. I will give the best account I can find out of their own Writings, what it is they aim at. *Bellarmin* stateth not the question, but somewhere saith, that *The true Church is a Company of men as visible and palpable as the Kingdom of* France, Spain, *or the* State *of* Venice. *Gregory de Valentia* above-mentioned affirms, that the Church is *Visible*, i.e. *is so placed in the light and sight of men, that in* any Age, that Congregation, *or* Company, *may be* evidently distinguished, *and as it were* pointed at with the finger, *which you may and ought determinately or particularly believe to be the true Church. This property of the Church* (saith he) *exceedingly troubleth all Hereticks.*

Ecclesia est cœtus hominum ita visibilis & palpabilis ut est cœtus populi Romani vel regnum Galliæ. Bellarmin. de Eccles. Milit. lib 3. cap. 2.

Ecclesia visibilis est, i. e. sic in luce hominum & conspectu posita ut quovis seculo evidenter internosci & quasi digito monstrari queat congregatio illa quam esse veram Ecclesiam determinatè credere possis ac debeas. Hæc autem Ecclesiæ proprietas universos Hæreticos pessimè habet. Anal. Fidei, lib. 6. pag. 30.

But it would exceedingly trouble him were he alive, or any man else, to reconcile this with his former concession. For if the true Church be so placed in the light and sight of men, that in *any Age* it may be *evidently discerned and pointed at by the finger*; how is it that (as he is forced to grant) *in times of Persecution, and over-spreading Error*, as under the Heathen Emperors, and in the prevalency of the Arian Heresie, *it is very hard to many, to see where the true Church is, yea none do discern it, but such as prudently weigh circumstances of times and things*, which the far greater part of men neither do nor can? Who of our Adversaries if he had lived in the days of *Hilary*, would not have taken the *Arians* for the true Church? Did not all, or the far greater part of *Bellarmin*'s Notes of the true Church belong to them only, as Multitude, Succession, temporal Prosperity, external Glory, efficacy of Doctrine, converting, or rather perverting, almost, as *Baronius* grants, the

Ad ann. 358.

the whole World? Would they have taken thoſe few for the true Catholick Church, who ſeparated themſelves from their heretical, but ſuppoſed infallible, Head and Guide of the univerſal Church, Pope *Liberius*? *Baronius* the Cardinal acknowledges that he communicated with the *Arians*, and in his own Letters ſtill extant, he profeſſeth, that in all things he agreed with them: Yea farther S. *Hilary*, *Athanaſius*, and S. *Hierome* write that he ſubſcribed to the Hereſie of the *Arians*, and yet *Bellarmine* and other of their Writers, make it an eſſential qualification of a Catholick or Member of the true Church, to hold Communion with the Biſhop of *Rome*, and to live under his Government; who inſtead of being an infallible Guide to others, may fall into damnable Hereſie himſelf. I would gladly know which Company was at that time the true Church, whether they that joyned with *Liberius*, or ſuch as ſeparated from him? Here I cannot but obſerve (which Cardinal *Baronius* takes notice of) that when by the favour of the Emperour *Conſtantius*, and the interceſſion of the *Arian* Biſhops, *Liberius* was upon his ſubſcription reſtored to his Biſhoprick, many Clergy-men choſe rather to ſuffer death, than to joyn in Communion with him; whom they themſelves account Martyrs, or at leaſt dare not condemn as damnable Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; the appellations they beſtow upon Proteſtants, for their not communicating with the *Roman* Biſhop.

Ad ann. 357. *v.* Bellarmin. de Rom. Pont. lib. 4. cap. 9. Liberius *poſt exactum in exilio biennium inflexus eſt, miniſque mortis ad ſubſcriptionem inductus, atque ita reſtitutus eſt Eccleſiæ.* Epiſt. ad Solit. vitam agentes. Hieron. in Catal. *In Fortunatiano*; *Subſcripſit Hæreſi Arianorum. Et in Chronico, ait* Liberium *tædio victum exilii in Hæreticam pravitatem ſubſcripſiſſe.* Liberius is declared to be a Heretick by the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth General Council, and Pope *Agatho*, and Pope *Leo* the Second. *Patet ex lib. de Romanis Pontificibus multos Clericos Romæ à Conſtantio necatos eſſe qui noluerunt cum Liberio communicare.* Baron. ad ann. 357. parag. 49.

But I have not yet done with *Valentia*, who in the ſame place farther granteth, that *the Eſſence and Truth of the Church*, i.e. *true Faith, Holineſs*, and the like, *are not viſible, neither can be evidently known or believed to be really in that company of men it ſelf, who are indeed the true Church.* Is not this the Proteſtants Inviſible Church? Who ſometimes ſay that it is

Non uſque adeò ipſi volumus Eccleſiam eſſe conſpicuam ut cenſeamus aut oculis cerni aut evidenti ratione intelligi poſſe ipſam etiam Eccleſiæ quaſi eſſentiam & veritatem, aut etiam proprietates ejus omnes. Non enim arbitramur palam aſpici aut evidenter cognoſci poſſe quod ulla congregatio ſit revera cœtus rectè colentium Deum, &c. Imò verò hæc in illa ipſa congregatione hominum ineſſe, quæ vera eſt Eccleſia, non niſi obſcurè fide credimus, &c. Anal. Fid. l. 6. p. 30.

one

one thing to ſee that which is the Church, *viz.* the Perſons publickly profeſſing true Religion in it; and another to ſee that it is a true Church, which depends upon the ſincerity of their Profeſſion, known only by God, who ſearcheth the heart. Nothing can be more evidently true than this: For ſuppoſe I ſee (and what can I ſee more?) a Company of men baptized into the Name of Chriſt, meeting together in Churches to ſerve him, to read, pray, receive the Sacraments, as the *Arians* and other Hereticks did, and many prophane Perſons or Hypocrites daily do; is this ſufficient evidence to aſſure me that they, and not others, who perform the very ſame outward acts of divine Worſhip, tho more privately, are the only true Church, to which I am bound under pain of Damnation to join my ſelf? How is it then true that he ſaith a little before, that the Church is ſo viſible, that in *any age that Company may be evidently diſtinguiſhed, and as it were pointed at with the finger, which you may and ought determinately and particularly believe to be the true Church?* In ſhort, The Perſons and outward profeſſion of the Members of the true Church are viſible, but that which makes them a true Church is ſtill inviſible; ſo that I am ſtill to ſeek for the true Church, eſpecially ſeeing 'tis granted by *Bellarmine, Turrecremata, Canus, Soto,* and others, that wicked Men and Hypocrites are only nominal or equivocal Members of the Church, that they are rather in or within, than of the true Church, as dead Members or ill humors are in humane bodies.

Hieron. in Comment. in Pſal. 130. *Eccleſia non in parietibus conſiſtit ſed in dogmatum veritate; ante 20 enim annos omnes Eccleſias has Hæretici poſſidebant, Eccleſia autem vera illic erat ubi vera fides erat.* Apud Bellar. de Eccleſ. Miſit. lib. 3. cap. 2. & cap. 9.

I will only add *Coſterus* a noted Writer amongſt them: *Chriſt*, ſaith he, *would have his Church not only* Viſible *but* very conſpicuous, *that the grace of God, which in this Congregation, and not elſewhere, is preſerved and conferred, may be known unto all men; whence he hath made her like to a City placed on a hill, and to a Candle ſet on a Candleſtick.* Here we may plainly perceive that a *mere Viſibility* of the Church will not content our Adverſaries unleſs it be *very conſpicuous*, ſo as that all Perſons may know it. The truth is, their Principles oblige them to no leſs.

Voluit Chriſtus non modo viſibilem eſſe Eccleſiam ſed valde conſpicuam, ut omnibus innoteſceret gratia Dei, quæ in hac congregatione, & non alibi, aſſervatur atque confertur. Unde eam civitati quæ in monte poſita eſt & candelæ ſuper candelabrum ſimilem fecit. Enchir. cap. 2. de Eccleſ. pag. 108.

For

For firſt they ſay, that God would have all men to be ſav'd and come to the knowledge of the truth, and that therefore he affordeth all men ſufficient means to come to the truth. Secondly, They deny that the Scripture, in regard of its imperfection and obſcurity, is ſufficient to this end, but that the teaching of the viſible Church is the Rule of Faith, which all perſons, eſpecially thoſe that are ignorant and unlearn'd, muſt by an implicite faith in all things adhere to. Whence thirdly, it unavoidably follows, that if God afford all men ſufficient means to come to the knowledge of the truth in order to ſalvation, and the teaching of the true Church be the ordinary means appointed thereunto, then the Church muſt be in all ages and places, not only viſible to ſome few diſcreet wiſe perſons, as *Valentia* ſaith, but very conſpicuous and clearly diſcernable to all, even the moſt ignorant and weak-ſighted, like a City ſet on an Hill, &c. Laſtly, They affirm (where lies the Myſtery) that their *Roman* Church is the only infallible teaching Church in and by its Head the Pope, to whoſe determination, as Pope *Boniface* ſolemnly determin'd and pronounc'd all are bound *de neceſſitate ſalutis* to ſubmit. The perpetual, illuſtrious and glorious viſibility of this their Church (as for other Churches they are not at all ſollicitous what becomes of them) is that they ſo earneſtly contend for. Their great Champion *Bellarmine* well perceiv'd this when he ſaid, that *in regard all points of faith depend upon the teſtimony of the Church* (i. e. their Roman Church) *unleſs we be moſt certain which is the true Church all things in Religion will be altogether uncertain.*

Subeſſe Rom. Pont. omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, definimus & pronunciamus omnino eſſe de neceſſitate ſalutis. Extravagant. *de major. & obed. Unam ſanctam. Cum omnia planè dogmata ex teſtimonio Eccleſiæ pendeant, niſi certiſſimi ſimus (certitudine ſcil. infallibili ut ibidem ait) quæ ſit vera Eccleſia, incerta erunt prorſus omnia. De Eccleſ. milit.* lib. 3. cap. 10.

III. Arguments againſt the Church's being always conſpicuous or eaſily diſcernable.

But that this kind of glorious, illuſtrious and conſpicuous viſibility neceſſarily and perpetually belongs to any particular, or their *Roman* Church is viſibly and palpably falſe; as the Scriptures and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories evidence. In *Elijahs* days there was a true Church of God in *Iſrael*; yet it was ſo far inviſible that the Seer or Prophet himſelf could not ſee it. Whence he complains that he was left alone,

1 King. 19. 18. altho God assures him he had reserv'd to himself 7000. that never bowed the knee to *Baal*. Let them not think to evade by saying that the Church of *Israel* was a particular Church, for so is the Church of *Rome*, which by all their infallibility can never be made the Catholick or Universal Church.

In the time of our Saviour the chief Priests with the consent of the generality of the people condemn'd and crucify'd him as a Blasphemer and a false Prophet, whilst only some few persons, obscure and contemptible in the eyes of the World, as *Simeon*, *Nicodemus*, &c. believed on him. I desire to know amongst whom the true Church was then to be found, and that in a conspicuous and illustrious state? Do not some of your own Writers affirm that there was no true faith to be found on Earth, I mean at the time of his crucifixion, but in the heart of the Virgin *Mary*.

Etsi non nisi duo fideles remanerent in mundo in iis salvaretur Ecclesia. Forta litium fidei. lib. 5. quoted by *B. Ives*, p. 83.

Durand. Rationale lib. 6. c. 72. *Turrecremata de Consecrat. Distinct.* 2. num. 4. *Ad annum Christi* 304. *Nomine Christianorum deleto qui rempub. everterant.*

To descend lower, in the days of *Diocletian* (the worst and last persecutor of Christians) such havock and prodigious destruction was made of the Christian Church, that several Trophies and Monuments, as *Baronius* grants, were set up in *Spain* in memory of the total extirpation of Christianity, *superstitione Christi ubique deletâ*. Where was then the *conspicuous*, as *Costerus* phraseth it, and illustrious state of the Catholick or particular *Roman* Church? Surely had not the Church of *Rome* her self, as well as other Christian Churches been in a great degree invisible as to the knowledge of the *Roman* Emperour and his Inquisitors, in all humane probability the name of *Christians*, as they boasted, had been wholly rooted out.

Ingemuit totus orbis & se factum esse Arianum admiratus est. Dialog. contra Luciferianos.

I might add the state of the Christian Church, even *Roman*, under the prevalency of *Arianism* and its heretical Head Pope *Liberius*, when, as St. *Hierom* writes, the whole World *sighed and wonder'd how it became Arian*. When the Catholick Bishops were banish'd from their Sees, and the Orthodox Christians forsaking the Churches worshipped God *in cryptis* in private houses and corners. Concerning which deplorable times St. *Hilary* writeth in this manner to such

ſuch as communicated with the *Arians: You are ill taken with the love of walls, you ill ſeek or reverence the Church of God in Houſes and Structures, Mountains and Priſons and Dungeons are ſafer. He adds, that 'twas hard to find in the Eaſt a Catholick Biſhop or people. Athanaſius* ſaith as much or more. *What Church,* ſaith he, *now adores Chriſt freely? Seeing if it be pious it is in danger. For if there be ſome pious and ſtudious of Chriſt, as there are every where many ſuch, they alſo, as the great Prophet ELIAS, are hid, thruſt themſelves into holes and caverns of the Earth, or wander in ſolitude.* *Malè vos parietum amor cepit, malè Eccleſiam Dei in tectis ædificiisque veneramini. Montes mihi & lacus & carceres ſunt tutiores. Addit: Rarumeſſe apud Orientem invenire aut Epiſcopum aut populum Catholicum.* Lib. *contr. Auxentium. Quæ nunc Eccleſia Chriſtum liberè adorat? Siquidem ſi pia eſt periculo ſubjacet. Nam ſi alicubi ſunt pii, ſunt atem ubique tales permulti, illi itidem abſconduntur,* &c. Epiſt. *ad ſolitariam vitam agent. Vid.* Apolog. *ejus ad Conſtant. & de fuga.*

Theſe things being undeniably evident, I deſire to know whether in thoſe days the true Church was *not only viſible,* but *very conſpicuous* to the ſight of all men, ſo that it might be *evidently diſtinguiſh'd, and as it were pointed at with the finger,* as *Coſterus* and *Valentia* affirm.

But what need is there of many words in this caſe? when our Adverſaries themſelves grant, *that a little before the end of the World when Antichriſt ſhall come, the external ſtate of the* Roman *Church ſhall ceaſe, and that the publick worſhip of God ſhall by perſecution be ſuppreſſed, and that the truly pious ſhall communicate with the Pope only in heart and ſoul.* The difference then betwixt them and us cometh only to this, that what we ſay hath been, they ſay ſhall be hereafter; whilſt it is agreed on both ſides that an illuſtrious conſpicuous viſibility is no eſſential property or inſeparable note of the true Church. *Paulò ante mundi finem externus ſtatus Eccleſiæ Romanæ ceſſabit, & publicum fidelium cum eâdem commercium, & ἀποστασία paſſim obtinebit, & tamen tunc pii corde & animo cum Papâ & Eccleſiâ Romana communicabunt.* Rhemenſes *in Annotat. in* 2 Theſſ. 2. & Revel. 12.

I now come to examine the places of Scripture mention'd in your Letter to evince the contrary. IV. Texts alledged for Viſibility (as meant by the Papiſts) anſwered.

The firſt and principal urg'd by *Valentia* and many other is, *Matth.* 15. 14, 15. *Ye are the light of the World. A City that is ſet on an Hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a*

Candle to put it under a Buſhel, &c. To which may be added, *Iſa.* 2. 2. 60. 20. 61. 9. *Dan.* 7. 14. quoted in your Paper. To all which the ſame Anſwer may be applied.

My reply is, that thoſe words do not prove a perpetual, conſpicuous and illuſtrious viſibility of the Church in all Ages to all perſons, which our Adverſaries contend for. Firſt, Becauſe the words are not ſpoken, at leaſt directly, of the Church general or ſucceſſive in all Ages, but of and to the Apoſtles perſonally, *Ye are the light of the World.* And ſeeing they were commanded by our Saviour to teach all Nations, we may reaſonably ſuppoſe that they were under a ſpecial protection of divine Providence until they had fulfill'd the work committed unto them. But the caſe of ordinary Paſtors and Teachers of the Church is not the ſame with that of Apoſtles. Secondly, Suppoſe we underſtand the words of the Church general or ſucceſſive, which we grant to be a light to the ignorant World and like a City ſet on a Hill; yet it cannot be deny'd, yea our Adverſaries grant it, that this light of Apoſtolick doctrine in the Church may be obſcur'd or eclipſed by error, ſcandal and perſecution, as the Sun and Moon ſometimes are, tho they be glorious and moſt viſible lights.

Aug. Epiſt: ad Vincentium ſupra.

In like manner a City ſet on an Hill may be ſo clouded by foggy miſts and vapors that it may become for ſome time inviſible, at leaſt not ſo viſible or conſpicuous as that any man may point at it with his finger.

The other Similitude of Mens lighting a Candle and ſetting it on a Candleſtick that ſo it may give light to all in the Houſe, ſignifies the clearneſs, univerſality and diffuſiveneſs of the doctrine taught by the Apoſtles. But that any one particular Church, *Greek* or *Roman*, ſhould be ſuch a Candleſtick as can never fail or be remov'd as well as that of *Epheſus* and many other Apoſtolical Churches wholly rooted out by *Mahometaniſm*, or which ſhould be, as our Adverſaries too groſly affirm, *more viſible* and diſcernable to all men than the light it ſelf (*viz.* of the Goſpel contain'd in the Scripture) plac'd in the Candleſtick, *i. e.* the Church; this I ſuppoſe no prudent man will take to be our Saviour's meaning in thoſe words.

Revel. 2.

That

That they make their Church (the Candleſtick) and its Authority more viſible to us than the truth or light of the holy Scripture, is ſo notorious I will not ſtand to prove it. * In a word; A Candle tho burning clearly on a Candleſtick may in time want ſnuffing, and ſo may the moſt Apoſtolical Church in after-Ages need Reformation.

Quæ ſit vera ſcriptura, & quis ejus verus ſenſus non poſſumus ſcire, niſi ex Teſtimonio veræ Eccleſiæ. Bellarmin. *de Notis* Eccl. lib 4. c.2.

The ſecond place is, *Matth.* 18. 17. Tell the Church; if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen or Publican. *Now,* ſaith the Letter, *It were very hard to be condemn'd for a Heathen or a Publican for not hearing a Church that hath ſo cloſely lain hid that none could hear, ſee, feel or underſtand it for* 900. *years.*

Firſt, I anſwer, That theſe words prove not the Church viſible or palpable to all men Heathens and Infidels enquiring after the true Church, but at moſt to Chriſtians only who live under the Church's government and ſubmit to her Cenſures. Secondly, The words relate to a particular Chriſtian Church of which a perſon is a member; for it were abſurd to imagine our Saviour ſhould oblige any Chriſtian if his Brother ſhould offend him, to tell the whole Catholick Church throughout the World his offence *per literas Encyclicas.* Yea, it's plain and undeniable, the place reſpects not the whole diffuſed number of Chriſtians, no not in any particular Church, but the Governours only. Now our Adverſaries will not I hope, ſay that any particular Church, except their own, much leſs its Rulers or Repreſentatives, ſhall be eminently viſible and conſpicuous to all Chriſtians at all times. Certainly our Saviour in this place does not promiſe any ſpecial privilege to the Church of *Rome* more than *Antioch, Epheſus* or any other Apoſtolical Church, to whom that Precept of telling the Church doth equally belong; ſome of whom are long ſince utterly extinguiſhed by the overflowing of *Mahometaniſm.* How can they then from this place infer that any particular Church ſhall be perpetually viſible and conſpicuous to the World exerciſing Church-Government over its members? Nay farther, How could the Chriſtians belonging to their *Roman* Church when under the perſecution of *Dioclefian* or *Conſtantius,* (at which time the Shepherds being ſmitten the ſheep were all ſcatter'd, the Church diſſipated and all Church-diſcipline interrupted) tell the Church, or make complaint

complaint to the Governours of it, when they ſcarcely knew where they were, to whom in caſe of offence and ſcandal to make complaint. Our Saviour's Precept then ſuppoſes the free exerciſe of Church-government, which in times of violent perſecution cannot be exercis'd or ſuppoſed.

Acoſta de Temp. noviſſ. lib. 2. cap. 15. *Teleſphorus de Magnit. tribulat.* pag. 32. *Aquipontanus de Antichriſt.* pag. 23.

I might add, That their own Writers, *Acoſta*, *Teleſphorus* the Hermite, and others confeſs, that when Antichriſt cometh all Eccleſiaſtical Order and publick ſervice of God ſhall be buried, the Church-doors deſtroy'd, the Altars forſaken, the Church empty, &c. Now I appeal to the conſcience of any man, whether at that time it would be poſſible in caſe of Scandal to tell the Church, when the Church ſhall be forc'd to hide it ſelf and all Eccleſiaſtical Order is ſuppreſs'd and diſſolv'd by the violence of Perſecution.

Laſtly, Whereas 'tis objected, that the Proteſtant Church hath ſo cloſely lain hid for 900. years that no man could ſee or underſtand it; this is very falſly affirm'd as I ſhall ſhew afterward, unleſs ſuch as profeſs'd the Religion of the Scriptures, Ancient Fathers and Councils, proteſting againſt ſome new *Roman* additional Articles, impos'd of late by Pope *Pius* and the *Tridentine* Council, were no true viſible Church of God.

Hieronym. *in* Nahum c. 2. *Chryſoſt.* Hom. 49. *in* Matth. *Nunc nullo modo cognoſcitur quæ ſit vera Eccleſia Chriſti, nimirum ex quo obtinuit hæreſis Eccleſias, niſi tantummodo per Scripturas.*

The laſt place, *viz.* 2 *Cor.* 4. 5. *If our Goſpel be hid*, &c. is leaſt of all to the purpoſe; for there Saint *Paul* plainly ſpeaketh not of the Church but of the Goſpel or Chriſtian Faith, which is clearly deliver'd by the Scripture, to which, as St. *Hierom* and St. *Chryſoſtom* acknowledge, we ought, eſpecially in times of Hereſie and Perſecution, to have recourſe for our eſtabliſhment in the truth; and if the Goſpel firſt preached and afterwards written by the Apoſtles (for what they firſt preached they afterwards by the will of God, as *Irenæus* ſaith, wrote) be hid to any, it's hid to them that periſh, whoſe minds the Devil hath blinded. Doth not this place expreſly confute our Adverſaries, who affirm that the Goſpel as reveal'd by the Scripture is dark, obſcure and inviſible to the Laity, that ſo they may hang their faith by a blind and implicite obedience on the viſibility and infallible Authority

Irenæus *cont. Hæreſ.* lib. 2. *Quæ præconiaverunt poſtea per Dei voluntatem ſcripſerunt*, &c *Coſterus Enchirid.* cap. 1. *Alphonſus de Caſtro cont. Hæreſ.* grant this.

of

of their Church or Popes, who may be, as ſome of them have been, notorious and manifeſt Hereticks? So that theſe words of St. *Paul* can do them no ſervice.

V. The Fathers alledg'd for the *Roman* viſibility conſider'd.

I come now to the Fathers quoted in your Letter; and firſt for *Chryſoſtom*'s ſaying, * *It is eaſier for the Sun to be extinguiſh'd than the Church to be darkned*; I wonder any ſober men ſhould require us to believe that on *Chryſoſtom*'s Authority which they do not believe themſelves. For the *Romaniſts*, *Valentia* and others, as we have ſeen, confeſs that the Church, even their *Roman* Church, may be obſcur'd or darkned; as it undeniably was under the Heathen and *Arian* Emperours, in times of prevailing Hereſie and Perſecution. So that *Chryſoſtom* muſt even by them be underſtood of a total, not partial, Eclipſe or darkneſs: for in that place he treateth of times of perſecution, wherein all grant the Church may be darkned, and ſaith, the Tyrants are gone and periſh'd, but the Church remaineth unconquer'd.

* Hom. 30. in Matth.

As to the places quoted out of Saint *Auſtin*, *Tract. in Joan. & de Unitate Eccleſiæ Cap.* 7. I anſwer, That he ſpeaketh of the ſtate of the Chriſtian Church as it was in his days, in its external luſtre and glory, retaining the Primitive Faith without addition or detraction. It was indeed ſtrange blindneſs in the *Donatiſts* he writeth againſt, not to ſee the true Church, which as a Mountain or light on a Hill was then plainly viſible before them all over *Africa*, yea the whole World; but to dare to reſtrain it to *pars Donati*, the faction of *Donatus*, as now the *Jeſuits* reſtrain it to the Popiſh party, was plain impudence. Nevertheleſs, St. *Auſtin* doth not ſay, that the Church ſhould always and in all after-Ages remain in that viſible, proſperous and illuſtrious ſtate, yea contrarily he confeſſeth, that it is ſometimes obſcur'd thro the multitude of ſcandals; that it is like the Moon that may be hid, that it *ſhall not appear by reaſon of the unmeaſurable rage of ungodly perſecutors, yea, ſo obſcur'd that the members thereof ſhall not know one another.*

Aliquando obſcuratur. Epiſt. ad Vincentium 47. *Eccleſia non apparebit impiis tunc perſecutoribus ultra modum ſævientibus. Epiſt.* 80. *ad Heſychium. Vide de Baptiſ. contra Donatiſtas* lib. 6 cap. 4. *& Enarrat. in Pſalmum.* 10.

This

This arguing then from the State of the Church of old in St. *Austins* days is just like theirs who would persuade us, that the Church of *Rome* is now the only true Catholick and Apostolick Church, because St. *Paul* 1600 years ago saith, their Faith was commended throughout the World, *Rom.* 1. *ver.* 8. (so was their Obedience also, *Rom.* 16. 19.) But doth the Apostle say they should continue in that Faith more than Obedience unto the end of the World, or that their Church alone should never corrupt the Faith or apostatize in any degree from it? He seemeth to say otherwise when he thus writeth to the *Roman* Church, *Rom.* 8. 18,19,20,21,22. Boast not against the branches ——— thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Because of unbelief they, *i. e.* the Jewish Church, were broken off and thou standest by Faith, be not high-minded but fear, for if God spar'd not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. And as to Christian Obedience, it's granted by *Bellarmin*, *Genebrard* and others, that some Popes have been so scandalously wicked, that they were rather Apostatical than Apostolical, and scarcely deserved to have their names register'd in the Catalogue of the *Roman* Bishops.

1 Tim. 4. 1.

De Pontif. in lib. 1. *in Præfat.* Genebrard. *Chronol.* lib. 4. *seculo* 10. Baronius in Ann. 912. num. 8. *& in* ann 985. num. 1.

VI.

Concerning the Papists demanding the Names of such as professed the Protestant Religion before the Reformation.

As for the second Question, wherein satisfaction is desir'd, to answer *Roman* Catholicks, *when they demand the names* of some Professors of the Protestant Religion before the Reformation; it being to them strange that if Protestancy be from the Apostles and hath been in all Ages, they can shew no Writings of some eminent Professors of it as well before the Reformation as many now since. To this I reply first, That altho the Apostles were not call'd by the name of Protestants, as neither were they by the name of Catholicks or Papists, yet they were really of that Religion Protestants do profess; for from the Apostles and their Writings have we learn'd the Religion we maintain against additional Popish Errors, and traditional or unwritten points of Faith. Such as these reckon'd up by Pope *Pius* as Articles of the *Roman*-Catholick Faith, which all Papists must swear to profess as necessary to salvation. That there are seven Sacraments

Sacraments properly ſo call'd, Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints and Angels, Worſhiping Images and Reliques, Indulgences, the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Supremacy over all Chriſtian Churches, Real and proper Sacrificing of Chriſt in the Maſs, Communion in one kind, *&c.* All which are either not mention'd in the Apoſtles Writings, or contradicted and condemn'd by them. Secondly, I anſwer, That the Ancient Fathers and Councils for 4 or 500 years at leaſt, (I might ſay more) after Chriſt were not in the points above-mention'd of Pope *Pius* his Faith, but either ſay nothing of them, or teſtifie againſt them, or at leaſt ſpeak doubtfully of them; whence I conclude that they were of the Proteſtant, not Popiſh, Religion. This I ſhall ſhew from their Writings. Yea, thirdly, That ſome of the New Articles of Faith before named cannot be prov'd to be any part of the ancient Catholick belief by the Authority of any eminent Writers for above 1000 years after Chriſt, particularly in the points of ſeven Sacraments, Purgatory, Indulgences, Communion in one kind, and ſome others. Laſtly, That there is ſcarcely any point, eſpecially of them before rehears'd, condemn'd by us in the preſent *Roman* Church, but we are able to produce multitudes of eminent Writers and ſome of their own Communion, who complain of them or proteſt againſt them, as well as we, in the Ages next before *Luther*. To perform my promiſe I ſhall now prove, 1. Aſſertion.
Firſt, That the Articles of the preſent *Roman*-Catholick Faith recited by Pope *Pius*, and added by him to the *Nicene* Creed, are either not mention'd at all in the Apoſtles Writings, or refuted and condemn'd by them.

VII. Seven Sacraments not taught by the Apoſtles. *Nec plura, nec pauciora. De* Sacram. lib. 2. c. 24. Chryſoſt. Ambroſ. Auſtin, *&c.*

Firſt, For their ſeven Sacraments. The Apoſtles no where teach us to acknowledge ſeven Sacraments, or that Matrimony, Orders, Extream Unction, Confirmation, Confeſſion are ſuch, and, as *Bellarmin* affirms, only ſuch. Baptiſm and the Holy Euchariſt we own, flowing, as the antient Fathers ſpeak, out of Chriſt's ſide, whence came forth Water and Bloud; which are anſwerable to the two only Jewiſh Sacraments, Circumciſion and the Paſſover, as we read, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2, 3, 4. More we find not. It's true, St. *Paul* diſcourſing of the Conjugal Union betwixt Chriſt and his Church, termeth

Ephes. 5. 32. termeth it μέγα μυστήριον, a great Myſtery. The vulgar *Latine* tranſlation renders it ambiguouſly and improperly *magnum Sacramentum*, a great Sacrament. Hence the *Romiſh* Church will needs have Matrimony inſtituted by God in Paradiſe to be a proper Chriſtian Sacrament; but St. *Paul* declareth he meant no ſuch matter; for, as Cardinal *Cajetan* obſerves, he immediately addeth, But I ſpeak of Chriſt and the Church.

In locum.

James 5. 14. St *James* alſo mentions Anointing the ſick with Oil; but that was in order to the miraculous gift of healing the Body, as we may gather from *Mar.* 6. 13. It had no ſpiritual effect on the Soul, as all Sacraments properly ſo call'd have and muſt have, as is granted. The forgiveneſs of ſins was by Prayer to God, not Oil, *ver.* 15.

So *Cajetan* expoundeth that place.

VIII.

Secondly, The Apoſtles did not teach Tranſubſtantiation, or that by conſecration the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are annihilated or turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſt's body and blood. Yea, St. *Paul* expreſly declares the contrary, for he calleth it Bread and Wine even after conſecration. *The Bread that we break* (but Chriſt firſt bleſſed and afterwards brake it) *is it not the communion of the Body of Chriſt? The Cup of Bleſſing we bleſs, is it not the communion of the bloud of Chriſt?* So that Bread and the Cup, *i.e.* by a Figure or Metonymy, as all muſt grant, the Wine in the Cup remain in the Communion as means whereby we obtain the communion of Chriſt's Body and Blood. In the next Chapter in 3 Verſes together he calleth it Bread. May not we call it ſo? or was it not what St. *Paul* call'd it? But he calleth it the Lord's Body. True. Yet not in a literal, but Sacramental ſenſe, even as the Cup, (which to be ſure is not tranſubſtantiated) is term'd his Blood or the New Teſtament and Covenant in his Blood, as the Lamb was call'd the Paſſover, Circumciſion the Covenant, Baptiſm the Laver of Regeneration, in which nevertheleſs *Romaniſts* do not believe any Tranſubſtantiation. This Bread we doubt not, is indeed Chriſt's Body, as that Rock in the Wilderneſs was Chriſt; as Chriſt was the true Vine or true living Bread, which no ſober

Nor Tranſubſt. *Durand. Biel, Scotus, Cameracenſis, Cajetan,* grant it can be not evidently proved from the Scripture. See below, *Matth.* 26. 26. 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. *Card. Contarenus de Sacram* l. 2. c. 3. *Canus, loc. Theol.* l. 3. c. 3. *Fiſher cont. Luther* c. 10. ſay the ſame, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27, 28. Verſe 29. The Church is called *Chriſts Body*, is it therefore his

Natural Body in a literal ſenſe? 1 *Cor.* 10. *John* 15. 1. Did Chriſt eat his own Body, when the Sacrament was adminiſtred and taken by him? So *Chryſoſtom Hom.* 40, in *Joan.* 3.

man

man will interpret in a literal, proper and ſubſtantial, but in a Sacramental, ſymbolical or typical ſenſe.

Thirdly, According to the doctrine of the holy Scripture there neither is nor can be Purgatory. This I prove from *Rev.* 14. 13. *Bleſſed are the dead that die in the Lord—for they reſt from their labours.* How do men who die in a ſtate of grace, and ſo in Chriſt the Lord, reſt from their labours, if as ſoon as they die they are tormented, or, as the *Roman* phraſe is, labour (none know how long) in the fire of Purgatory? It's confeſs'd by our Adverſaries that all impenitent and wicked men, who being void of grace die not in the Lord, go to Hell, not Purgatory. How do righteous and good men enter into peace and reſt according to *Iſa.* 57. 20. if after death they enter into fiery torments? St. *Paul* ſaith it generally of all Believers in Chriſt, not Martyrs only, as ſome would evade, that they ſleep in Jeſus, and would not have us to ſorrow exceſſively for them: How do they as it were ſleep in Chriſt's boſom? Why ſhould we not mourn exceedingly for them, if they probably lie in flames of fire under unſpeakable torments not much inferiour to them of Hell, as is granted, excepting only the duration or continuance? Add *John* 52. 4. *He that believeth ſhall not come into condemnation, but is paſſed from death to life.* But he that cometh unto Purgatory cometh into condemnation.

IX. Nor Purgatory. *Polydore Virgil. de Invent.* l. 1. c. 1. *Biel in Can. Miſſæ lect.* 57. *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, lib. 8. tit. *Indulgent. Valentia de Indulg.* grant that Purgatory is not to be found in Scripture, nor Indulgences. 1 Theſſ. 4. 14.

Poſſibly it will be objected that Saint *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 12. plainly delivereth the doctrine of Purgatory, *The fire ſhall try every mans work: he ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire.* But how can it be a plain place for Purgatory, when *Origen* and *Auguſtine*, yea *Bellarmine* himſelf, confeſs it's a moſt obſcure one, and therefore very unfit to ground an Article of Faith upon. St. *Paul*'s whole diſcourſe in that Chapter is Metaphorical and alluſive, as thoſe words eſpecially evidence, *v.* 15. ὡς διὰ πυρός, as it were by fire, or as by fire, *i. e.* with much danger and difficulty, like one who runs through the fire to ſave his life. That the place proveth not the *Roman* doctrine of Purgatory is manifeſt by this argument urg'd by * Saint *Auguſtine.* The fire St. *Paul* mentioneth ſhall *try every man's*

Patres aliqui, per ignem non intelligunt ignem Purgatorii ſed Divini Judicii; quomodo loquitur Paulus. 1 Cor. 3. *Bellar.* lib. 1. *de Purg* cap. 1. *Auguſtin. de fide & operibus*, c. 15. *Ad Dulcitium qu.* 1. *Bellarmin. de Purgator.* lib. 1. c. 5.

* Ἆρ' οὐκ ἔδει τῶν ὕδατον λαβὼν ὅπως τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἑαυτῆς ἀπεξάρασ τῆς τλοῆς; As *Chryſoſtom* expounds it, *Tom.* 5. *Hom.* 28. *p.* 467. *Ad Dulcitium qu.* 1.

work. The fire of Purgatory, as they themſelves grant, tryeth *not every mans* work; for it tryeth only ſuch mens works as die under the guilt of venial ſins, or ſuch mortal ones as are forgiven, but are not fully ſatisfied for, and therefore (which is a contradiction) are ſtill to be puniſh'd. Therefore St. *Paul*'s fire cannot be the fire of Purgatory into which the beſt and worſt ſort of men come not at all. Again, It's one thing to try mens works whether they be good or bad, and another to puniſh and by puniſhing to purge away the guilt of ſuch as are bad. In all probability St. *Paul* by the fire in that Text figuratively expreſſed the ſevere judgment of Chriſt at the laſt day. *The day ſhall declare it.* Then indeed our Saviour like a Goldſmith or Refiner ſhall exactly try every mans work, &c. then ſuch as retain the foundation, *i. e.* true faith in Chriſt, and build upon it wood, hay, ſtubble, *i. e.* erroneous opinions and fond imaginations, (of which this Purgatory doctrine is one inſtance) ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire, *i. e.* with much danger, undergoing a ſtrict ſcrutiny.

Ignis probationis, non purgationis, Aug. de fide & operibus c. 15.

Non eſt plenè remiſſa culpa, quamdiu peccator eſt reus ſolvendæ pœnæ. Ceanus loc. Theolog. lib. 12. pag. 435.

Exemplo reatu eximitur & pœna. Tert. de Baptiſmo, cap 5.

So *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, and *Anſelm*, approved by *Bellarmin*, lib. 1. *de Purgator.* c. 5. pag. 586. Malachi 3. c. v. 3.

X. Nor Prayers to Saints. or Angels, Pſalm 50.

Fourthly, The Scripture no where commands, adviſeth or encourageth us to pray to Saints or Angels but to God only. *Call upon me in the time of trouble*, &c. *When ye pray ſay, Our Father*, &c. In the Old Teſtament *Bellarmine* grants, there is no mention of Invocation of Saints, becauſe the Patriarchs, Prophets and Saints were in Limbo, not admitted to ſee God; of which opinion as to Chriſtians, were many of the ancient Fathers, altho the Papiſts now reject it as an Error. In the New, at leaſt if we except that moſt abſtruſe Book, the Revelation, *Eccius*, *Salmeron*, *Bannes* and others confeſs that it hath no footſteps. Yea, Saint *Paul* expreſly condemns worſhiping Angels out of a voluntary humility after the vain Philoſophy of the *Platoniſts*, who yet did not worſhip them as Gods, any more than Papiſts, but only as Meſſengers or Mediators betwixt God and men. Elſewhere he asketh the *Roman* Church (which ſhe ſhould remember) *How ſhall they call on him, i. e.* lawfully, *on whom they have not believed?* But we believe in God only, not

De Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 19. *Becanus in Euchirid.* c. 7. *Salmeron in* 1 *Tim.* 2. *diſput.* 2. *art.* 7. *Vide Sixtum Senenſ. Biblioth.* lib. 6. *Annotat.* 345. *Enchiridion in* 1 *Tim.* 2. *diſput.* 7. *art.* 22. *qu.* 1. *art.* 10. Col. 2. 18. Rom. 10. 14.

not in any Saint or Angel. How shall we then call on them? I might add, that the Church of *Rome* hath no certainty, even of humane Faith, that the Saints in Heaven know our wants or hear our Prayers; for they know not on what ground to settle this belief. Some flying to extraordinary Revelations, some to the brittle and voluntary Glass of the Trinity, some to the reports of Angels, intruding into the things they have not seen nor can be assur'd of, cleaving to what is uncertain, and neglecting what is undoubtedly lawful, *i.e.* to pray to God through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, the only Mediator betwixt God and man, the only Advocate with the Father, who is alone the Propitiation for our sins, who so loved us as to die for us, which neither the blessed Virgin nor any Saint ever did. In a word, Prayer or Invocation is, as all grant, *Latria*, an act of divine Worship, and therefore must by no means upon any pretence be given in any degree to fellow-servants, but reserv'd to God our Sovereign only. *See thou do it not* (as the Angel said to St. *John* who would have worshiped him, not as God, but as the subordinate revealer of those glorious mysteries to him) *I am thy fellow-servant, worship God.* They who are for worshiping Angels, Why do they not, as St. *Augustin* saith, hearken to the Angel, saying, *See thou do it not.* As for their usual evasion, That they do not pray to them, but only desire them to pray for them, it's vain and impertinent; for they not only pray or desire them to pray for them, but they directly pray to them, using the very words and Prayers which *David* and other holy men of God have us'd to God himself; yea they beg of them such things as none but God can bestow; as forgiveness of sins, increase of Grace, and Eternal Glory. No man that has read their Breviaries and Prayer-Books can be ignorant of the truth of this.

Certa ratione nescimus an Sancti nostra vota cognoscant, quamvis piè hoc credamus. Cajetan. in 22. qu. 88. Art. 5. 1 John 2. 2. 1 Tim. 2. 5.

Rev. 22. 9. *Utinam velletis ipsos colere, facile ab ipsis disceretis non illos colere. Audite Angelum, doctorem* &c. August. in Psalm 96. *V. Psalterium B. Virginis apud Chemnitium in Exam. Concilii Trident.*

See Bishop *Andrews* his *Posthuma* against Cardinal *Perron.* Doctor *Brevint*, &c.

XI. Nor the worshiping of Images,

Fifthly, The Scripture no where commends to us or commands worshiping of any Images, but expressly forbids it. No Precept nor Example can be found of any Prophet or Apostle that requir'd or practis'd it. The second Commandment

mandment, most suspiciously, if not consciously, thrust up into the first by Popish Catechisms, is clearly against it, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, nor* (which is more comprehensive) *the likeness of any thing in Heaven or Earth*, &c. *thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them*, &c. Now, what things are in Heaven? God, the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, Angels and glorifi'd Saints. We may not therefore make (to worship them) the Images or likenesses of any of these. All are forbidden. Surely if any Image were to be made and worshiped, certainly that of God might. But God himself expressly forbids it, *Deut.* 4. 15, 16. for saith he, *When I came down from Mount* Sinai, *ye saw no manner of similitude*, &c. *take heed therefore lest you corrupt your selves by making any graven or molten Image, and likeness*, &c. Hence some, even of the *Roman* Church, condemn the making of any image of God. How highly was God incens'd against the *Jews* for making and worshiping the golden Calf, which yet was, tho not a formal Image, an Emblem or memorial of the true God? Hence the Feast was proclaim'd to be kept at least ultimately and intentionally, as Papists use to distinguish, *Jehovæ*, to the honour of Jehovah. Could the *Jews* be such Sots themselves as to imagine that the Calf, made a day or two before, brought them out of *Egypt* several months before it was made? They call'd it therefore their God only as a representative or Hieroglyphical memorial of him they had a mind to see, (as Heathen Idolaters ever had) going before them in Effigie. *Make us Gods* (or a God) *to go before us.* Yet St. *Paul* expressly condemns this Feast and Worship as plain Idolatry. *Neither be ye Idolaters as were some of them*, as it is written, *The people sat down to eat and drink*, &c. And Idolatry is *summus seculi reatus* as *Tertullian* hath it, no less than high Treason against the Majesty of God in giving his honour upon any pretence, or in any respect to what is not God but a Creature, as every Image, whether materially or formally consider'd, is. Now it's the known doctrine of *Aquinas*, *Azorius*, and the *Jesuits*, that the very same honor, *latria*, which belongs to God or

Inter traditiones est Imaginum veneratio. Aquinas par. 3. q. 25. art. 3. This Law is not ceremonial, but natural, or moral; as *Irenæus*, *Tertul.* *Cyprian*, *Austin* affirm. See *Bellarmin.* lib 2. *de Imag.* cap. 7. The 2. *Nicene* Council say it was ceremonial, who yet ground worship of Images, not on Scripture, but Ecclesiastical Tradition, *V. Concil. Nic.* 2. *act.* 7. *apud Coriol.* *Abulensis in* loc. qu. 5. *Aquinas* part. 3. qu. 25. art. 3. *Durandus* lib. 3 dist. 9. qu 2. *ait fatuum esse imagines ad repræsentandum Deum facere. Vasquez* lib. 2. *de Adorat.* disp. 4. c. 2. who quoteth others. Exod. 32. 5. *Lactant. Instit.* lib. 2. Exod. 32. 1. *In* Exod. 32, 6. 1 Cor. 10. 7. Par. 3. qu. 25. art. 3. & 4. *Azor. Instit.* lib. 9. c. 6. *Suarez.* Tom. 1. disput. 54. sect. 4. *Vasques de adoratione* lib. 2. c. 4. *Valentia*, *Costerus.*

Christ

Chriſt is to be given to their Images for their ſakes whom they repreſent; as if out of reverence to the King I ſhould honour his Judges, Officers or Favourites with the very ſame outward expreſſions of reverence, homage and Allegiance I yield to himſelf. Would any wiſe Prince take this well? In a word; Let it be only remember'd that God, eſpecially in this particular of worſhiping Images, hath declar'd himſelf to be a jealous God, viſiting the iniquity, Exod. 20. ſignally the Idolatry, of Fathers upon their Children, of which good King *Joſiah* the Son of *Manaſſeh* was a remarkable inſtance. 2 Chron. 5. 3. 24.

Sixthly, Concerning Indulgences, *i.e.* a Power in the Pope for Money to grant out of the common Treaſury of Chriſt and the Saints merits amaſſed together, as much as he pleaſeth to any perſon for the freeing of him from the temporal puniſhment due here or in Purgatory for his ſins; as if Chriſt alone were not abundantly ſufficient; is a doctrine which hath no real ground, not the leaſt, in holy Scripture. We read indeed of St. *Paul*'s remitting to the penitent inceſtuous *Corinthian* part of that Eccleſiaſtical Penance which was impoſed on him, but of making over to him, or any one elſe, the merits of any Saints, we find not the leaſt intimation. Cardinal *Cajetan*, *Durand*, *Roſſenſis* and others grant that Indulgences have no ground in Scripture, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter; yea they are contrary to it, which every where aſcribes all remiſſion of all ſorts of ſins, and conſequently of all puniſhment properly ſo call'd to be inflicted by God for them, wholly and onely to the blood, merits and ſatisfaction of Chriſt our Saviour and Redeemer, who is highly diſhonour'd by theſe pretended Pardons. Saint *Paul*, not without ſome indignation, asketh the *Corinthians*, *Was* Paul *crucified for you?* If the ſufferings of St. *Paul* and other Saints ſatisfie, at leaſt in part, for mens ſins, or, which is all one, for the temporal puniſhment due to them; why may it not be truly ſaid, that *Paul* as well as Chriſt was crucifi'd or ſuffer'd death for us? Indeed I cannot but wonder at the ſtrange perverſeneſs of our Adverſaries, who will by no means grant that the merits, righteouſneſs and obedience, eſpecially active of Chriſt, are or can be through faith imputed unto us for our juſtification and remiſſion of our ſins, and

XII. Nor Indulgences.

V. Caſſand. conſult. art. 12. in fine. 2 Cor. 2. 10.

1 Cor. 1. 13.

and yet earneſtly contend that by the Papal Indulgence the merits, faſtings, and prayers of Saints, Monks and Fryars may be imputed or made over to any that will be at the coſt to purchaſe it.

XIII. Nor the Popes Supremacy.

Seventhly, As to the Popes Supremacy over all Chriſtians and Churches, altho a great noiſe is made with *Thou art Peter*, &c. *and to thee will I give the Keys*, &c. Certainly, as ſome of their own Writers confeſs, it hath no ground in Scripture, yea, it is contrary thereunto. For that our Saviour, altho his Apoſtles were often diſputing who ſhould be chief amongſt them, never declar'd *Peter* to be his Vice-roy or Vicar, which would have put a final end to all this contention about Supremacy. Yea, he makes them all alike equal, even after he had ſaid, *Thou art* Peter, *&c.*

Card. Cuſanus concordant. lib. 3. cap. 13. *Marſilius defenſ.* part. 2. cap. 18.

Licèt fortè non ſit de jure divino Rom. Pontif. ut talem Petro ſuccedere, &c. Bellar. de P. R. l. 1. c. 12. Matth. 22.26.

V. Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 2. c. 1. *de primatu Jacobi. Hic primus Epiſcopalem cathedram cepit; cum ante cæteros omnes ſuum ei in terris thronum Dominus tradidiſſet. Epiphan. adv. Hæreſ.* lib. 3. Tom. 2. pag. 1039. *Jacobus Apoſtolorum princeps, Ruffinus* Hiſt. lib. 2. cap. 1.

Secondly, Saint *John* was the Diſciple whom Jeſus loved in an eſpecial manner above the reſt of the Apoſtles, for no doubt he had a love for every one of them. Saint *James*, his Brother or Couſin was made Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* by the Apoſtles, and ſucceeded our Saviour in his Throne, as *Epiphanius* ſaith. Why might not either of theſe plead a right of Supremacy as well as *Peter?*

2 Cor. 12. 11. 1 Cor. 15. 10. 2 Cor. 11.28.

Thirdly, Saint *Paul*, altho he was *Noviſſimus Apoſtolorum* the laſt Apoſtle call'd after all the reſt, yet he ſaith he thought he came not behind even the chiefeſt Apoſtles; yea, that *he labour'd more than they all, and had on him the care of all the Churches.* Can we think he would have preſum'd to have written of himſelf in ſuch an high manner if he had thought that Chriſt his Lord had appointed St. *Peter* as his Vice-gerent to be the Head, Sovereign Prince and ſupreme Governour of all the Apoſtles, Churches and Chriſtians? Nay farther, it is clear from *Gal.* 1.12,17.18. That St. *Paul*

Yet *Stapleton* durſt write, *Petro data eſt poteſtas mandativa, atque regiminis. Apoſtolis poteſtas executiva, tantùm eſt gubernationis. Doctrin. Princip.* lib. 6. c. 7.

neither

neither receiv'd inſtruction nor Authority to preach the Goſpel from St. *Peter*, but immediately from Chriſt himſelf, and executed his Apoſtolick Office three years before he ever ſaw St. *Peter*'s face. Which is furthermore evident and undeniable from *Gal.* 2. 9. That *James* is plac'd before *Cephas* or *Peter*, and *Cephas* and *John* gave to *Paul the right hand of fellowſhip*, as to one equal in Authority with themſelves; and in *ver.* 11. we find *Paul* withſtanding *Peter* to his face, not ſeemingly (as St. *Hierom* thought, oppoſed therein by Saint *Auguſtine*) but really and in earneſt, for *Peter* was indeed, as the Text ſaith, *to be blamed*. All which particulars laid together evince, I think, to any ingenuous man that St. *Peter* was not ſupreme over all the Apoſtles; for where there is an Equality there can be no Supremacy. But St. *Paul* doth aſſert and prove himſelf equal, not inferiour, to St. *Peter*. Therefore St. *Peter* was not Supreme, at leaſt St. *Paul* did not think him to be ſo. Now if S. *Peter* had not Supreme Power over all Chriſtians, how can the Pope pretend to it as ſucceeding St. *Peter* in his Authority? Can he have more Power than St. *Peter* had? As for thoſe words, *Thou art Peter, &c.* it is to be obſerv'd that our Saviour ſaith not, Thou art *Peter* and on *thee*, but *on this Rock*, i. e. this faith thou haſt profeſſed that I am the Son of God, *will I build my Church*, and ſo many of the Fathers expound it, as I ſhall ſhew afterward. 'Tis true, Our Lord promiſed to give unto *Peter* the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and accordingly after his Reſurrection he gave him them; but our Saviour gave them him and the reſt of the Apoſtles all together at the ſame time and in the ſame manner. And as the Chriſtian Church was in ſome ſenſe built on *Peter*, i. e. in reſpect of the faith he taught, ſo it was equally *pari modo & ex æquo* (as St. *Hierom* ſaith) on the reſt of the Apoſtles, agreeable to that of St. *Paul*, being built on the foundation of the Prophets and Apoſtles, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf (not *Peter*) being the *Chief Corner-ſtone*. It is not therefore true

Cypr. Epiſt. 71. *Nec Petrus ſuper quem Dominus ædificavit Eccleſiam cùm ſecum Paulus diſceptaret, vendicavit ſe primatum tenere, & obtemperari ſibi oportere.*

Petrus & Paulus ambo principes, Card. Cuſanus Epiſt. 2. de uſu Commun. Gal. 2. 11.

Erat Paulus Princeps Apoſtolorum honore par Petro, ne quid dicam amplius. Chryſoſtom. in Galat. c. 2.

Petrus univerſalis Epiſcopus non vocatur, Greg. lib 4. Epiſt. 32.

Paulus aſcendit Hieroſolymam Petri cognoſcendi cauſâ, ex Officio & Jure ſcil. ejuſdem fidei prædicationis. Tertul. de Præſcr. *non ſubjectionis.* Matth. 16. *V.* Cyprian Epiſt. unit. *Eccl. in locum hunc.* It's St. *Chryſoſtoms* obſervation Sermon de Pentecoſt. & Hom. 55. in Matth. Add Hilary lib. 2. de Trinit. 16. *Ambroſe* in Eph. cap. 2. Pope Gregory the Great, in Pſal. 102. v. 25. *Cyril* de Trinit. lib. 4. *Aug. de Verb. Domini*, Ser. 13. *Beda* in cap 21. *Joan.* Lib. 1. in *Jovinian.* Compare *Origen.* in Matth. 16. Epheſ. 2. 20.

that ſome affirm, that our Lord gave the Keys firſt to *Peter* to be communicated by him to the reſt of the Apoſtles. No. The Scripture plainly ſaith, Chriſt breathed on them all at once together and ſaid, *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins ye remit they are remitted*, &c. Here the Keys promis'd to *Peter* are given not onely to him, or firſt to him to be given to the reſt of the Apoſtles by him, but to all of them together in one and the ſame breath without preferring one before another. Neither doth that other place, *feed my Lambs, feed my ſheep*, prove in the leaſt that Chriſt committed his whole Church to *Peter* onely as Univerſal Paſtour and Head of it; for to feed Chriſt's ſheep is to teach them with the word of life; and this is charg'd immediately and equally on all the Apoſtles who had their Miſſion and Commiſſion not from *Peter* but from Chriſt himſelf, ſaying, *All power is committed to me*, &c. *Go ye therefore teach all Nations*, &c. Yea, this duty of Feeding, as alſo Ruling, implied, as ſome think, in the word ποιμαίνειν, is a Duty incumbent on all inferiour Paſtors and Biſhops, as St. *Peter* himſelf acknowledgeth, *Feed the flock of God taking the care thereof*, ἐπισκοποῦντες. To this I might add that St. *Paul* had a greater part by far of Chriſts flock under his Paſtoral care than St. *Peter*, for he was the Apoſtle of the Uncircumciſion or *Gentiles*, preaching to them; *Peter* of the Circumciſion or Jewiſh Nation. From all which it is evident that the Pope, ſuppoſing him (which is not at all granted) to ſucceed *Peter* in his whole Apoſtolick Power *in plenitudinem poteſtatis*, it no way follows that he is or can be Supreme Head of the Univerſal Church. Other Apoſtles in their Apoſtolick Churches planted by them being as to Eccleſiaſtical Power not at all inferiour but equal to him and the *Roman* Church.

Poteſtatem Apoſtoli receperunt immediate à Chriſto. Franciſ. *de victoria* Relect. 2. qu. 2. *Concluſ.* 3. & 4. John 20. 22. Matth. 16. 16. John 21. 17.

Non Petrus ſed Chriſtus Græcis Paulum præfecit. Chryſoſt. Hom. in 2. cap. ad *Galatas.* Matth. 28. 18, 19.

Cùm dicitur Petro, paſce oves meas, ad omnes dicitur. Aug. *de agone Chriſti* c. 30. 1 Pet. 5. 2. Acts 20. 28. Gal. 2. *Chryſoſt.* at leaſt in 18 places calls St. *Paul* τὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλον. Caſaubon. *Exercit.* 16. *Paulus Apoſtolorum maximus.* Origen. Hom. 3. in Numer. *Quamvis Apoſtolis omnibus poſt reſurrectionem ſuam parem poteſtatem Chriſtus tribuat*, &c. *Cypr. de unitate Eccleſiæ, Paulus erat Petro* ἰσότιμος, *nec opus habuit Petro*, Chryſoſt. in Gal. c. 2.

As for a priority of Place or Order, in regard *Rome* was at firſt before *Conſtantine's* days the Seat of the Emperour, we deny it not; but this Preheminency, as the General Councils of *Conſtantinople* and *Chalcedon* declare, was given bythe Ancient

cient Fathers and Bishops (they say not by any appointment of Christ) in regard it was the Imperial City; of which more hereafter.

But to put an end to this Controversie, we will appeal to an infallible Judge such as the Pope himself shall not refuse, even Saint *Peter* himself, whose words are these, *Submit your selves*, &c. *whether to the King as supreme*, &c. If St. *Peter* acknowledge not himself, but the King, to be Supream, methinks it should ill become his Successours to deny Kings to be supream over them. But possibly it will be said, St. *Peter* meant this supremacy onely in matters Civil, not Ecclesiastical. Well, we take what is granted. How is it then consonant to Apostolical doctrine for St. *Peter*'s Successors to exempt, and that in civil matters, all Clergy-men from the jurisdiction and commands of the King, as if they were not his Subjects as well as others? Yea farther, to absolve the Laity also from all obedience to their natural Princes, cursing all such as obey them, stirring them up when they think fit to fight against, depose and murther them. Is this to acknowledge the King supream? *Peter* did but draw his sword to rescue Christ the Son of God from the hands of Murtherers, and he is commanded to put it up; And may Popes, as they often have done, command Subjects to draw it against their lawful Sovereigns? But the King here spoken of was an Heathen, even *Nero*. True. However all Christians according to Apostolical doctrine must be subject to their King tho an Heathen, and ought they not much rather then to be subject to him being a Christian? St. *Paul*'s Precept is general, *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers*; which Powers were at that time Heathens, yet every soul, *i.e.* a Synecdoche, every Person, tho an Apostle or Evangelist, as St. *Chrysostom* comments on that Text, much more the Pope, ought to be subject.

1 Pet. 2. 13.

Caverius de Potestate Pontificis lib. 2. cap. 23. Cajetan. in Aquin. 2. qu. 99. art. 3.

See the *R. R.* Bishop of *Lincoln*, his observation on the Pope's Bull, against Q. *Elizabeth.*

Κἂν Ἀποστόλος ἦς καὶ εὐαγγελίστης, κἂν θεσπέσιος, κἂν ὅσιον· *Chrysost. in locum.* As also *Theodoret.*, *Theophylact.* and *Oecumenius in locum.* Add *Bernard. Epist.* 64. *ad Senonensem Archiepisc. Qui seipsum excipit, seipsum decipit.*

Possibly some will reply, That the Church and St. *Peter* the Head of it had no Authority over Heathens which are without, but that they had a supremacy over all Christians and consequently over Kings as Christians.

If this exception be of any weight, it unavoidably follows that whilſt *Nero* was an Heathen St. *Peter* was his Subject and he Sovereign, but if he had become a Chriſtian S. *Peter* was his Sovereign and had the ſupremacy over him. Was not this an excellent reaſon to perſuade *Nero* to become a Chriſtian, whereby he muſt deprive himſelf of the Sovereignty? The truth is, Chriſt came not *tollere jura ſed peccata mundi*, to take away the ſins, not the rights of the meaneſt Subjects, much leſs of Kings, or in the leaſt to diminiſh their
1 Tim. 6.1,2, juſt Authority. The Apoſtles expreſly charge Children to be obedient to their Parents, Servants to their Maſters, tho they were Heathens and themſelves Chriſtians. Dominion is not founded in Grace, neither is Chriſt's Kingdom, as he himſelf profeſſed, of this World, for then would *my Servants fight*. He that gives Kings converted a Crown of Glory, deprives not them of their Earthly one, or any due right belonging to it. Obedience therefore in all things either active or paſſive, is neceſſarily to be yielded unto them as ſupream Governours.

VIII. Nor the Sacrifice in the Maſs.

Eighthly, Concerning a real and proper Sacrifice of Chriſt in the Maſs or Holy Euchariſt, it is expreſly contradicted in the Scripture, eſpecially by St. *Paul*, *Heb.* 7.27. 9,25,26, 27,28. 10. 10. In which places the bleſſed Apoſtle diſtinguiſheth Chriſt's Sacrifice from, and prefers it before the Levitical ones, in regard they were reiterated and often repeated, not ſo this; but *by once offering of himſelf*, *once* offered up *by himſelf*, and *once for all*, he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified. As then men properly can die no more than once, ſo Chriſt can be properly ſacrific'd no more but once. 'Tis St. *Paul*'s own argument. In the Maſs therefore Chriſt is not properly ſacrific'd. Mark what an abſurdity in the Apoſtles judgment would follow thereupon. If Chriſt ſhould be offer'd by himſelf, or others often, more than once, then muſt he have often ſuffered. But Chriſt hath ſuffer'd once and cannot ſuffer again. Therefore he is not offer'd again by himſelf, or by any Prieſt in the Maſs as a proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead, which our Adverſaries affirm. Yea, if Chriſt were truly and properly ſacrific'd in the Maſs, he muſt neceſſarily ſuffer death a thouſand times over; for ſacrificing any living thing,

Heb. 9.27, 28.

ver. 26.

and

and such is Christ, to God, implieth killing and taking away the life of what is sacrificed, as the very name Θυσία from Θύειν noteth. But I hope *Romanists* will not say they kill Christ in the Mass: if they deny it, then Christ is not there properly sacrific'd; if they should attempt it, the thing is impossible; for Christ, being now impassible and in a glorify'd State, can die no more, as we read, *Rom.* 6. 9. When then they distinguish of sacrificing Christ in a bloudy and unbloudy manner, and say they offer up and sacrifice him *incruentè*, without bloudshed, they yield the cause; for all proper sacrificing implieth destruction, as *Bellarmine* grants, or if it be a living thing the shedding the bloud is killing of what is sacrificed, for without shedding of bloud there is no remission.

Ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut plane destruatur, & ipsa entia substantia consumatur. Bellar. lib. 1. de Missa cap. 2.

De Missa lib. 10. cap. ul.

If by their sacrificing Christ in the Mass they meant only a representation to God or men of Christ's bloudy sacrifice of the Cross, or a commemoration of his death, termed, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. a shewing and setting it forth visibly and sacramentally by eating of that Bread and drinking of that Cup, we should not oppose them: but Representation or Commemoration of Christ's death is one thing, and proper Sacrificing his Body and Bloud, really, corporally, and carnally as it was on the Cross, is quite another.

As for *Bellarmin*'s Reply, that Christ is sacrific'd not under the likeness of a living thing but of Bread which hath no life, and therefore there is no necessity he should be slain or kill'd in the Mass, it signifies nothing. For I ask, Is the likeness of Bread onely offer'd up to God as a propitiatory Sacrifice, or Christ himself, his Body and Bloud, who is a living Person; yea, liveth for ever? If Bread onely, 'tis blasphemous to make it a propitiatory sacrifice for sin. If Christ himself, who is a living Person, be truly and properly sacrific'd, he must be truly and properly slain.

Bellarmine placeth the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the Priests manducation, or eating, and consumption not of the substance of Christ's Body, but the Accidents or Appearance of Bread only, *de missa l. 1. c. ult.* But a true Sacrifice requireth a consumption of its substance; as is above by him granted. *Ergo.*

As for their usual pretence that Masses apply to us the Vertue and Merits of Christ's Passion: I answer, That the Sacrament of the Eucharist is abundantly sufficient thereunto, and

and peculiarly instituted to that very purpose; *for the bread that we break is it not the Communion* or communication *of the Body of Christ, and the Cup of blessing that we bless the Communion of the Bloud of Christ?* And what is the Communion or communication of Christ's Body and Bloud broken and shed for the remission of our sins, but the communication or application of the Merits of both unto us in order thereunto? So that the reiteration of Christs sacrifice of himself on the Cross is altogether unnecessary.

IX. Nor Communion in one kind only.

As to the ninth Article of Pope *Pius* his Creed, That it is not necessary to receive both Bread and Cup in the Holy Sacrament of Christ's Body and Bloud, it is so plainly and almost palpably contrary to the institution, example and command of Christ himself, as also the Apostolical tradition of St. *Paul*, that 'tis a wonder how any Christians dare own any such Doctrine. *Take, eat, drink, do this in remembrance of me*; so our Lord at the first institution of it. Saint *Paul* repeats this Institution to the *Corinthians*, commending it to the observation of the whole Church, Laity as well as Clergy; joineth eating of the Bread and drinking of the Cup together four several times in four Verses, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27, 28, 29. Layeth down an expres Apostolical Canon, *Let a man examine himself*, &c. What man? An Apostle only? or a consecrating Priest? No. But any ordinary Christian capable of this Sacrament. Well. What is then to be done? *Let him eat of that bread*, as it is his necessary and indispensable duty to do; but is that all? No. For he addeth, *And let him*, (whether Layman or Clerick, whether Consecrator or not) also *drink of that Cup. For as often as ye* (Christians in general) *eat of this Bread and drink of this Cup, ye shew forth* (as is your duty to do and which otherwise you do not) *the Lords death till he come.* Doth it not look like Antichristianism for Christ's Vicar to presume to alter, mutilate, or in any substantial part (as the Cup in the Eucharist is acknowledg'd to be) to abrogate his Lords *Institution* and Command? How dare any Christian divide asunder what Christ and Saint *Paul* have join'd together? The receiving the Cup is as neces-

Panis & vinum ad essentiam sacramenti pertinent. Bellarmin. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 6. *v. Concil. Trident. Panis & vinum non tam essentiales, quam integrales hujus sacramenti partes videntur*, Bellarmin. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 22. *Sine vino igitur sacramentum non integrè administratur.*

sary

ſary to any Chriſtian, Clerick or Laick, as the ſacred Bread. By the ſame reaſon the Church of *Rome* forbids the Laity one, they may both; for both are equally commanded, both are as neceſſary as either. The Romiſh pretended Power to diſpenſe with the Laws of God and to alter the inſtitutions of Chriſt is alone a ſufficient argument to diſcover how little they regard the Apoſtolical Doctrine or Primitive practice of the Church, from which, as we ſee, they have manifeſtly departed. In a word, If the Pope and his Councils have power to alter and diſpenſe with, yea countermand, Chriſt's expreſs Laws and Inſtitutions, then there is nothing fixed or certain in Chriſtian Religion; but it is made, as a learned Traveller obſerves, a mere piece of humane Policy to be fram'd, alter'd and modell'd at the wills and pleaſures of men; which directly tends to promote Atheiſm; for which crime *Italians* are notorious.

Sir Edward Sandys *Europæ Speculum.*

Thus I hope I have made it evident to any unprejudic'd Perſon that the 9 Articles above-mention'd, which Pope *Pius* not 200 years ago added to the old *Nicene* Creed, as parts of the true Catholick Apoſtolick Faith, without which no ſalvation is to be had or expected, are errors and corruptions of it, contrary to the doctrine that the holy Apoſtles have deliver'd to them and us in their Writings. So that I may juſtly ask them, Where was your Creed and Church before Pope *Pius*, who was hardly ſo old as *Luther*.

Concerning ſome practices in the *Roman* Church which are againſt Scripture. As 1. Service in an unknown Tongue.

I might add ſeveral other Doctrines and Practices as contrary to Scripture (if I underſtand any thing in it) as Darkneſs is to Light; particularly, that unreaſonable ſervice of God in a Tongue the people do not underſtand. Can any thing be more plainly contradictory to the whole fourteenth Chapter of 1 *Cor.* Doth not Saint *Paul* there condemn all Speaking, whether in Sermons, Prayers or Thankſgivings, in the Church in an unknown Tongue? *ver.* 2. Unknown, not to God; who knows all things, even Sermons in *Latin*, *Greek* or any Tongue elſe, but to Men. He prefers Prophecying, *i. e.* Preaching or expounding the Scripture, before Tongues, *i. e.* ſtrange and not underſtood by the Hearers, for this very reaſon; becauſe he that ſpeaketh in an unknown Tongue ſpeaketh to God, not unto men, for no *man underſtandeth him, howbeit in the Spirit*, i.e. by a miraculous gift of the Spirit,

Ver. 3. Spirit, as the gift of Tongues was, *he ſpeaketh myſteries*, i. e. profound and admirable Truths. But he that propheſieth or preacheth in a known Tongue ſpeaketh unto men, to Edification, Exhortation and Comfort. He that ſpeaketh in
Ver. 4. an unknown Tongue edifieth himſelf, not the Church. But Saint *Paul* would have the whole Church edifi'd or profited by whatever is ſpoken. Hence he commands *ver.* 26. all things to be done to edification, and forbids any one to uſe his miraculous gift of Tongues in the Church unleſs he interpret what he ſaith, or another for him, that ſo the Church may receive *Edifying*, i. e. ſpiritual profit, being built up in their moſt holy Faith. Is it not as clear as the day at Noon, that according to St. *Paul*'s doctrine there is no profit or edification redounding to the People by whatſoever is ſpoken in the Church in an unknown Tongue? Neither doth he in that Chapter ſpeak only of Sermons (Papiſts themſelves are not ſo abſurd as to preach in *Latin* to their people) or private Conferences, as *Bellarmine* would evade, he ſpeaketh generally of whatever is ſpoken in the Church, it muſt be in a Tongue known to the people, that ſo the people may be profited by it, in regard elſe they are not edify'd or profited at all. Neither doth he ſpeak of Sermons only, but Prayers and Thankſgivings: hence *ver.* 15, 16. *I will pray with the ſpirit, and I will pray with the underſtanding alſo, I will ſing with the ſpirit, and I will ſing with the underſtanding alſo.* So that in St. *Paul*'s judgment it's neceſſary to pray and ſing
Pſalm 47. 7. Praiſes, as *David* ſaith, with underſtanding. Then he adds, Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſs (God) with the Spirit, *i. e.* by an extraordinary gift of ſtrange Tongues beſtow'd by the Spirit on many in thoſe days, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned ſay Amen *to thy giving of thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt?* Where two things are as plain as if they had been written with a Sunbeam. Firſt, That St. *Paul* in that Chapter diſcourſeth not of Sermons or Conferences onely, but Prayers and Hymns. Secondly, That the unlearned cannot, as they ought, ſay
Juſtin. Martyr, Apol. 2. Hieron. in Epiſt. ad Galatas, lib. 2. in præfat. *Amen* to Prayers or Hymns of Thankſgiving they underſtand not. We uſe, as the ancient Church did, to ſay *Amen* to Prayers, not to Sermons or Conferences. So that Saint *Paul* expreſly condemns Prayers in an unknown Tongue

uſed

uſed at this day by the *Roman* Church in her *Latin* Service. And there is ground to think this is one reaſon why they ſuffer not the Laity to read the Scriptures, leſt they ſhould by them diſcern this amongſt other of their palpable, erroneous and corrupt practices. This may be a ſecond inſtance that the Romiſh Religion is not Apoſtolical.

2. Denying the uſe of the Scripture to the Laity. *V. Claudium Eſpenceum in Titum* cap. 2.

For what can be more contrary to our Saviour's command, *John* 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures*, &c? And that of Saint *Paul*, *Col.* 3. 16. *Let the word of Chriſt dwell in you richly in all wiſdom and ſpiritual underſtanding*? Yea, to the very end of Gods giving the Scriptures, than to forbid the generality of the people to read them, leſt they ſhould by it become Hereticks, *i. e.* Proteſtants? Did Saint *Paul* write his Epiſtles to the learned or Clergy only at *Corinth*, *Epheſus*, *Philippi*, &c. and not to the whole Church? Yea, doth he not adjure them at *Theſſalonica* to cauſe his Epiſtle to be read, not onely to the Rulers or Elders of the Church, but to all the holy Brethren or Saints? Might they hear what was written to them, but not read it? Were they not *Greeks*, and did not Saint *Paul* write unto them in their own vulgar Tongue? To what end, if not that they ſhould read it? Otherwiſe ſurely he would have written to them in *Hebrew* or *Syriack*, for he had the gift of many Tongues.

1 Theſſ. 5. 27.

But ſay ſome Politicians, The common people are apt to miſtake and to wreſt the Scriptures to Hereſies and their own deſtruction.

To which I anſwer, Firſt, If the Scriptures be ſo apt to be miſunderſtood, and do more hurt than good, why ſhould we look upon them as a ſingular bleſſing of God to his Church? Secondly, Do onely unlearn'd men wreſt the Scriptures? We know the old Hereticks, as *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, *Pelagius*, &c. were neither unlearn'd nor Laicks. Thirdly, Why did St. *Paul*, if the Scripture be ſo dangerous to the common people, command his Epiſtle to be read to all the holy Brethren? Might they not miſtake his true meaning by hearing it read as well as reading it? Laſtly, I anſwer, The Church of God is not to be govern'd by the late Policies of men, but by the Laws of Chriſt and the example of the Primitive Church; who altho many damnable Hereſies aroſe in thoſe Ages, and were colourably

Plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, &c. Index libror. prohib. Reg. 1.

Cyril. contra Julian. lib. 6.

maintain'd by the Scripture, as *Julian* the Apoſtate objected, yet never forbad any man to read the Scripture, but exhorted and encourag'd the Laity, even Women to do it. A Licence to read the Scriptures would have been looked upon in thoſe days as a prodigious Novelty. Becauſe many people receive the Sacrament of Chriſts Body and Blood unworthily to their own damnation, may therefore the Laity be wholly and generally kept as well from that Bread as they are by *Romaniſts* from that Cup unleſs they have a ſpecial Licence from the Church? But concerning the judgment and practice of Primitive times, we ſhall ſay more by and by. I might add more inſtances, but theſe may ſuffice to make good my firſt Aſſertion, that the preſent *Roman* Faith or Religion is not grounded on the holy Scriptures.

Hom. 2. in Matth. Chryſoſt. Hom. 3. in Lazarum Hom. 9. in Coloſſ. Hieron. Epiſt. ad Euſtochium, Salvinam, Celantiam, in Epitaphio Paulæ.

Aſſert. 2. The ſence of Antiquity concerning the Points in Diſpute.

The ſecond thing I am oblig'd to ſhew, is, That the Points above-mention'd are no parts of the true antient Catholick Faith, or were ſo eſteem'd by the holy Fathers and Councils for at leaſt 4 or 500 years after Chriſt, but rather condemn'd and rejected by them.

Art. 1. Concerning the ſeven Sacraments.

I will begin with the Doctrine of the ſeven Sacraments. The antient Fathers when they treat of the Sacraments of the Church in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the word (for it is equivocal) mention two onely, *viz.* Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper. Theſe *Juſtin Martyr* in the end of his 2d Apology, where he deſcribeth the publick ſervice of the Church on the Lord's days, takes notice of, and none of the other five. *Chryſoſtom*, *Cyril* and *Theophylact* on *John* 19. As alſo *Ambroſe*, *Auſtin* and *Damaſcen* write, that the Water and Bloud that came out of our Saviours ſide, ſignify'd the Sacraments of the Church, *viz.* the Water, Baptiſm, and the Bloud, the Euchariſt. *Irenæus* no where mentions any more Sacraments than theſe two. Saint *Auſtin* ſaith, Chriſt hath left us a *very few Sacraments*, numero pauciſſima, *Baptiſm and the Euchariſt*. 'Tis true, The Fathers ſometimes term Confirmation, Orders, &c. Sacraments; but then they uſe the word in a more large ſenſe, as when they call the Doctrines of the Trinity, *Incarnation*, &c. Sacraments, *i. e. Myſteries*. Our Saviour's waſhing his Diſciples feet, *the ſign of the Croſs*; yea *Polygamy* are ſometimes honour'd by *Cyprian*, *Auguſtin*, *Bernard*, with

V. Auguſtin. de Symbolo. Ambroſ. de Sacram. Card. Richelieu hence grants there are properly but two, *Examen Pacific.* Epiſt. 118. *ad* Januar. *V. Ambroſ. de Sacram. Incarnation. V. Cyprian. de ablution. pedum. Aug. de bono Conjug.* 1. 18. & lib. 1. cont. Fauſt. c. 14. *Bernard. de cœna Domini.*

the

the name of Sacraments, *i. e.* ſacred or myſtical Signs; In which ſenſe there may be not onely ſeven but ſeventeen Sacraments. But to avoid falling into a Logomachia or ſtrife about words, it is agreed, as *Bellarmin* himſelf grants, that the eſſential note of a proper Sacrament is to communicate juſtifying Grace. Do holy Orders communicate juſtifying Grace, or Matrimony either? If the latter, I wonder why they ſhould prohibit it the Clergy. If the former, ſurely there would not be found ſons of *Eli* or *Belial* in their Church who know not the Lord. But enough of this at preſent.

De Sacram. l. 1. c. 11. *Coſterus Enchir.* p. 340. *Peter Lombard* and *Durandus* ſay; Matrimony confers not Grace. See *Caſſandr. Art.* 14.

Art. 2. Concerning Tranſubſtant.

Secondly, The Ancient Fathers did not believe or teach the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, *i. e.* that by conſecration, the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine ceaſe to be, and are turn'd into the very ſubſtance of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which he now hath being at the right hand of God.

* *Ignatius* ſaith, that in the holy Eucharift *one and the ſame Bread is adminiſtred to all.*

Alphonſus de Caſtro de Hæreſ. lib. 8. ſaith the ſame: It was firſt taught by *Paſchaſius*, anno 818. See *Bellarmin. de Script.* * *Ad Philadelphin.*

Juſtin Martyr calleth it Bread and Wine after Conſecration, and ſaith, *our fleſh and bloud are nouriſhed by them:* I adjoin, But mere Accidents cannot nouriſh our bodies. Therefore the true ſubſtance of Bread and Wine ſtill remain. Our Adverſaries dare not affirm that our bodies are nouriſh'd by tranſmutation of Chriſt's Body into our fleſh and bloud, and all proper nutriment of humane bodies muſt be by ſome ſubſtance. He addeth a little after, that the Deacon uſeth to carry to the ſick *Bread and Wine* to be receiv'd at their own Houſes. *Irenæus* declareth that the Eucharift conſiſts of two things, one *terreſtrial*, viz. the Elements of Bread and Wine; the other *Celeſtial*, *viz.* Chriſt's Body and Bloud.

In Apol. 2. Τροφὴ ἐξ ἧς σάρκες ἡμῶν τρέφονται. In like manner *Irenæus* lib. 5. c. 12. *Bellarmin*, lib. 2. de Euch. cap. 4. *ad finem.* *V. Bonavent.* l. 4. *Sent. Diſt.* 12. art. 3. qu. 1.

Iren. Lib. 4. adv. Hær. c. 34. *Ex duabus rebus conſtat, terrena & cæleſti.*

Pæd. l. 1. cap. 6. *διὰ συμβόλων τὸ αἷμα οἶνον ἀλληγορεῖται.*

Clemens Alex. underſtood thoſe words, *Unleſs ye eat the fleſh of the Son of Man*, in a ſymbolical or figurative ſenſe; and diſputing againſt the *Encratites*, who condemn'd all uſe of Wine, he confutes them from the Example of our Saviour who drank in the holy Euchariſt of the fruit of the Vine. An evident proof that *Clemens* did not believe any tranſubſtantiation of the ſubſtance of the Wine into the very Bloud of Chriſt.

Pædag. l. 2. c. 2. in fine. *Τοῦτο μοῦ ἔστι τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου.*

Tertullian diſputing againſt *Marcion*, who held that Chriſt had not a real but phantaſtick body onely, (as *Romaniſts* ſpeak of the Sacramental Elements, which ſeem only to be what in truth they are not) draws an argument from the Euchariſt, ſaying, A figure of a Body argues a true Body; (in another place, Chriſt repreſented by Bread his Body) But Chriſt taking Bread made it his Body, ſaying, *This is my Body, i. e.* the figure of my Body. So *Tertullian* underſtood it. *Marcion* might eaſily have retorted this Argument, if the ſubſtance of Bread remained not in the Sacrament, by ſaying, As the Bread in the Sacrament ſeems to be Bread, but is not truly and really ſo, in like manner Chriſt's body appear'd to be a true humane Body, but was not really what it ſeem'd.

In *Marcion* lib. 1. c. 14. *Repræſentat corpus ſuum pane.*

Ad Marcion. lib. 4. c. 4. *Hoc eſt corpus meum, hoc eſt figura corporis mei. V.* lib. 3. in *Marcion.* c. 19. *corporis ſui figuram pani dediſſe.*

Origen in his third Dialogue againſt *Marcion* uſes the ſame argument, and in his ſeventh Homily on *Levit.* he ſaith, In the Goſpel there is the Letter which killeth him who underſtandeth not ſpiritually. If according to the letter you take thoſe words, *Unleſs ye eat the fleſh of the ſon of man*, &c. *Occidet hæc litera*, this letter or literal ſenſe will kill ye. And in another place he is not affraid to affirm, that the conſecrated Elements according to what is material in them go into the belly and ſo into the draught, which it were horrid blaſphemy to affirm of Chriſts natural Body. But he aſcribes it to his ſacramental, typical or ſymbolical Body, as he there calls it.

V. Hom. 9. *Si ſecundùm literam ſequaris occidit hæc litera.* Hom. 7. In cap. 17. Matth. *Juxta id quod habet materiale. Hæc de Typico Symbolicoq; corpore.*

Cyprian diſputing againſt the *Aquarii*, who would not uſe Wine but Water onely in the holy Euchariſt, argueth in this

Epiſt. 63. *Vinum quo Chriſti ſanguis oſtenditur.*

manner,

manner, Where there is no Wine in the Cup, the bloud of Chriſt cannot be expreſs'd, for we ſee the bloud to be ſhown, (*oſtendi*) in the Wine. And in his Comment upon the Lords Prayer he applies thoſe words, *Give us this day our daily bread*, to the ſacramental bread. The ſame *Cyprian* declares in his Sermon of the Lords Supper what manner of body is in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, when he ſaith, Who continually, even to this preſent day, doth create, ſanctifie and bleſs his Body, diſtributing the ſame to godly Receivers. Now it's undeniable that Chriſt's very own proper body is not continually created, ſanctified or bleſſed.

Veraciſſimum & ſanctiſſimum creat & corpus ſuum ſanctificat. De cœna Dom.

The words of *Athanaſius* are very remarkable. "Our Lord diſtinguiſheth the Spirit from the Fleſh, that we might learn that the words he ſpake *John* 6. *were not carnal, but ſpiritual.* For to how many men was his body enough to eat, that it ſhould become the food of the whole World? But therefore he mentions his Aſcenſion into Heaven, that he might draw us off from a corporal ſenſe, and thenceforward ſhould underſtand his Fleſh he ſpake of as heavenly and ſpiritual Food πνευματικὴν τροφὴν, *for the words I ſpeak to you are ſpirit and life*; as if he had ſaid, my Body which is ſhown and given for the World is given for food that it may be ſpiritually πνευματικῶς communicated to every one.

Ad Serapion. De Spir. S. In cap. 6. *Joann. V. Cyprian. de cœna Dom. & Auguſt. de verbis Apoſt.* Serm. 2. Tom. 10. *ſpiritualiter intelligenda ſunt, niſi manducaveritis carnem,*

&c. Aug. Tract. 27. in Joan. ubi plura.

Cyril of *Hieruſalem* ſaith under the Type, τύπῳ of Bread, Chriſts Body is given thee, and under the Type of Wine, his Bloud.

Myſtagog. lib. 4. where he granteth that in *John* 6, &c.

Except ye eat, is to be underſtood πνευματικῶς ſpiritually.

Nazianzen termeth the Bread and Wine ἀντίτυπα antitypes of Chriſts Body and Bloud. In like manner *Dionyſius Areopag.* and *Baſil* in his Liturgy.

But I muſt not forget *Gregory Nyſſen*; As, ſaith he, the Altar is by Nature a common Stone, but being conſecrated to God's ſervice is made an Holy Table; and as the Euchariſtical Bread is at firſt common Bread, but when the Myſtery, *i. e.* Myſtical Prayer of conſecration hath ſanctify'd it,

In Laudem Gorgoniæ. Orat. in Baptiſ.

is

is called and is the Body of Christ. As the Priest to day a common man by benediction is made a Teacher of Piety, and nothing changed in body, hath his soul transform'd by invisible Grace, so the Water in Baptism when it's nothing else but water by the heavenly blessing of Grace reneweth a man. Where it's evident *Gregory Nyssen* alloweth no other Transubstantiation in the Eucharist than in Baptism, the Ordination of a Priest, or the Consecration of an Altar.

Chrysostom in his Epistle to *Cæsarius* (which is to be seen in the *Florentine* Library*, as *Peter Martyr* a *Florentine* witnesseth, as also in the University-Library at *Oxford*) writeth after this manner, Before the bread be sanctify'd, we call it Bread; but the divine Grace sanctifying it, we call it the *Lords Body*, altho the nature of bread remain. These words directly overthrow Transubstantiation. In another place the same Father discourses after this manner, If it be so dangerous to apply to private uses these hallowed Vessels in the which is not the *very true body of Christ*, but onely the Mystery of his Body is contain'd, *&c.* much more our bodies to sin. Adding, That we ought to climb up into Heaven, when we receive the Communion, if we would have the fruition of Christ's Body, yea rather above the Heavens; for, saith he in another place, *Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the Eagles be gather'd together.* The Lord is the Carcass because of his death, and this is a Table for mounting Eagles, not for pratling Jays.

I shall now add the words of St. *Ambrose*, who discoursing of our Saviour's celebrating the holy Sacrament with his Disciples, breaking bread and giving it to them, saying, *Take, eat, this is my body*, &c. adds, As ye have received the similitude of my death, so drink also the similitude of my precious bloud. This oblation is the figure of the Body and Bloud of the Lord. In another place, Christ is touch'd by Faith, not bodily.

* Which is published since this Author wrote. See the Exposition of the Doctrin of the Ch. of *E.* in answer to the Bishop of *Meaux*, *in Append.* It is quoted by *Damascen. contra Acephalos.*

Etiamsi Natura panis permansit. Hom. 11. *in* Math.

V. Athanas. ad Serap. de SS.

Comment. in 1 Cor. 10.

V. Chrysost. Hom. 46. *in Joan.*

Sicut mortis similitudinem sumpsisti, ità etiam similitudinem pretiosi sanguinis. De Sacramentis lib 4. cap. 5. *Hæc oblatio est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini.* Ibid. *Fide tangitur Christus, non corpore.*

Let

Let us now hear *Theodoret*'s testimony, Our Saviour, saith he, in the institution of the Eucharist chang'd the names (not natures) of things, and applied that to his body, which belonged to the symbol or sign of it, and to the sign what appertain'd to his body, which he did, that such as partake of the divine Mysteries should not be attent on the nature of those things they see, but by the change of names should believe that mutation which is made by Grace. For he, (that is Christ) that called what is by nature a Body, Wheat or Bread, the same honoured the signs or symbols with the names of his Body and Bloud, not changing their Nature, but adding Grace to Nature. And when the *Eutychian* Heretick would hence draw an argument, that as the signs of Christs Body and Bloud are one thing before Consecration, another after it; so our Lord's body after it's Union to his divine Person ceased to be in substance what it appeared, and was chang'd into the divine Nature of the Godhead. *Theodoret* replieth upon him, You are taken in your own Net; for the Mystical signs after Consecration recede not from their former nature, but remain in their former substance, form and appearance. Mark. He saith not onely in their former *form and appearance*, but in their *substance* also. This is an irrefragable testimony against the Novel Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

In Lucam lib. 6. cap. 8. So Saint *Jerom* in Psal. 50. *Dei, tui corpus & sanguinem mente continge, cordis manu suscipe.*

Dial. 1. 8.

Οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβολῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικώς.

Οὐ τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ ἐχήματος καὶ εἴδους.

I will add the words of *Gelasius*, who was, as some say, Bishop of *Rome*; but however one that liv'd towards the latter end of the fifth Century. His words are plain in his Book against *Eutyches* and *Nestorius*. The Sacraments we receive of Christs body and bloud are divine things, by which we are made partakers of the divine Nature, and yet the substance or nature of Bread and Wine ceaseth not. And indeed the Image of the body and bloud of Christ in the sacramental participation is celebrated. We must therefore think that of Christ our Lord which we profess, celebrate and take in his Image, *i. e.* the Sacramental signs of his Body and Bloud, that as these by the operation of the Holy Ghost pass into a divine substance, and yet remain in the propriety of their own nature; so that great mystery of the

Lib. de duabus Christi Naturis.

Tamen non definit esse substantia vel Natura panis & vini Imago & similitudo, &c.

In ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus & sumimus. Permanent tamen in sua proprietate.

Incarnation

Incarnation whose Vertue they *represent*, shew one whole true Christ consisting of two Natures properly remaining.

The same is affirmed by the Patriarch *Ephraim, in Photii Bibliotheca* Cod. 229.

I purposely conclude with Saint *Augustin*, who hath with the consent of the more Ancient Fathers, deliver'd several things which utterly overthrow the present *Roman* Article of Faith, Transubstantiation. As first, That Christ's Body or Flesh is not to be eaten in a proper, carnal, oral, but figurative and spiritual sense; not by the mouth of the body, but by Faith the mouth of the Soul. For having laid it down as a general Rule, that whensoever the Scripture seems to command any thing wicked or flagitious, we must understand it as a figurative and improper form of speech, he instanceth in those words, *Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man*, &c. *Figura est ergo*, It is therefore, saith he, a figure, requiring us to communicate in Christ's Passion sweetly, and profitably, remembring that his flesh was crucify'd and wounded for us. The same is affirm'd by *Cyprian de cœna Domini*, As often as we do this in remembrance of him we whet not our teeth to bite, but with a sincere Faith we break the holy Bread. Which is, saith he, *Cibus non dentis aut ventris, sed mentis*, meat not of the mouth or teeth, but mind. In like manner *Cyril Catec. Mystag.* 4. *Ambrose de Sacramentis* lib. 1. cap. 4. *Idem Serm.* 58. *& in Lucæ* cap. 10. v. 24. Besides others of the Fathers I shall not now mention.

I. Tract. 25. in *Joan.* *Basil* in Psal. 33. saith the same. Lib. 3. de Doctrin. Christ. cap 16. *Flagitium jubere videtur* *Nolite parare fauces sed Cor. Nos non tangimus Christum, sed credimus.* Augustin. Serm. 33. in Lucam. *Devorandus auditu, ruminandus intellectu, fide digerendus,* Tertul. de Resur.

Secondly, He expresly affirmeth that wicked men in the Sacrament do not eat Christ's body or drink his bloud. Of the Lord's Table, saith he, some receive to life, others to damnation; but the thing whereof it is a Sacrament every man receives to life, none to death. To eat that meat and to drink that drink our Saviour explaineth when he saith, *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud dwelleth in me*; whence he that dwelleth not in Christ, (*proculdubio*) questionless neither eats nor drinks spiritually, altho he carnally and visibly press with his teeth *the Sacrament of Christ's body and bloud*; but rather eats and drinks the *Sacrament* of so *great a thing* to his own condemnation, because being unclean he presumes to come to the Sacrament of Christ.

II. Tract. 26. in *Joan.* *Cyprian de cœna* saith the same. Compare Aug. De Civit. Dei l. 21. c. 25.

Whosoever

Whosoever eateth me shall live by me. In another place; He that is at discord with Christ or an enemy to Christ, neither eateth his body nor drinketh his bloud, altho he daily receive indifferently (as if there were no difference betwixt that bread and common bread) the Sacrament of so great a thing to the punishment of his own presumption. Which is no more than what *Origen* had written long before him on *Matth.* 15. where he saith, If it were possible for any wicked man, persevering such, to eat the Word made flesh, seeing he is the living bread, it would not have been written, *Whosoever eateth this bread shall live for ever.* St. *Hierom* in *Jerem.* lib. 4. cap. 22. and also *cap.* 66. in *Esai.* affirms the same, saying, That Hereticks do not eat the body or drink the bloud of Christ in the Sacrament, because then they should have everlasting life.

Non dicitur qui manducat digne, sed qui manducat me. Cajetan. in locum.

Sentent. 339. *Qui discordat à Christo non corpus ejus manducat*, &c. *V.* Ambrose *de iis qui myster. initiantur*, cap. 9.

III.

Thirdly, Saint *Augustin* expresly affirmeth, that our Fathers the Patriarchs and Prophets under the Law did eat the same spiritual meat and drink the same spiritual drink with us under the Gospel, *i. e.* Christ: *for they drank of that Rock which follow'd them, and that Rock,* St. *Paul* says, *was Christ*, *Tract.* 26. on *John. Contr. Faustum. lib.* 19. *cap.* 16. Whence it undeniably follows, that the eating of Christ's flesh in an oral carnal manner is not necessary to salvation, which before Christ's Incarnation was impossible as it is now unprofitable.

In signis diversis eadem fides. Aug. Tract. 45. in *Joan. ubi plura legas.* Lib. 20. *cont. Faustum*, c. 21.

IV.

Fourthly, Saint *Augustin*, *Epist. ad Dardanum*, writeth, that Christ's body being a true humane body necessarily taketh up a space answerable to its quantity; and saith, That to deny a body to take up space, is to deny it to be a true body. And adds, That the body of Christ is not everywhere, but in a certain determinate place. Whereby he utterly overthrows the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, the possibility of eating and chewing, or, which is all one, the swallowing down whole Christ's body, that it should be in a thousand places at once, and should be contain'd whole under the least piece of Wafer. Which is in effect to revive the Heresie of *Marcion* and the *Manichees*, who denyed the verity of Christ's Body turning it into a Phantasm, Sprite or Spirit. But I cannot omit his words upon the 98th *Psalm*, where he brings in our Saviour speaking thus to his Apostles:

Epist. 57. *Tolle à Corporibus locorum spatia & nusquam erunt. Christus ubique per id quod Deus est, in cœlo autem per id quod homo est*, &c.

Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducu-

caturi eſtis. Sacramentum vobis commendavi, &c. Compare *Cyprian de unctione Chriſmatis. Chriſtus tradidit Diſcipulis figuram corporis ſui.* Auguſtin. in Pſalm 3. *Non hoc corpus quod videtis, manducaturi eſtis. Sacramentum commendavi vobis quod ſpiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos.* Epiſt. 23.

Ye ſhall not eat this body ye ſee, nor drink that bloud that my Crucifiers ſhall ſhed. I have commended to you a Sacrament which being ſpiritually underſtood, ſpiritualiter intellectum *ſhall give you life.* What can poſſibly be ſaid more plainly by any Proteſtant againſt Tranſubſtantiation? Our Adverſaries anſwer, That they did eat the very ſame body which they did ſee, but not *eodem modo*, not in a mortal, viſible, but in an inviſible, immortal and impaſſible manner. Which Anſwer ſignifies nothing; For altho not in the ſame manner, yet they grant the very ſame body was really and ſubſtantially eaten by the Apoſtles which they ſaw preſent with them at the Table, and that not in a ſpiritual and Sacramental, but in a corporal, carnal and ſubſtantial ſenſe, which perfectly contradicts what Saint *Auguſtin* there ſaith, *Ye ſhall not eat the body ye ſee, &c.* Again, I would gladly be reſolv'd whether the Apoſtles did eat Chriſt's very body then preſent as mortal or immortal. If as mortal and paſſible, then they did eat it *eodem modo* after the ſame manner, as it was there preſent and ſeen by them; if as immortal, how did then Chriſt's body really die upon the Croſs? And then it muſt be granted that Chriſt's body was immortal before his Reſurrection or Aſcenſion. I will onely add, that I be not too tedious, his words in his Epiſtle to *Boniface, If Sacraments had not ſome ſimilitude or likeneſs of thoſe things of which they are Sacraments, they would be no Sacraments. From this ſimilitude for the moſt part they receive the names of the things themſelves they repreſent.* As then, *ſecundùm quendam modum, after ſome manner, the Sacrament of Chriſt's body is his body, ſo the Sacrament of Faith is Faith.* Thus I hope I have made it evident, that the preſent Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is no part of the Primitive and Catholick Faith; which the Fathers in the five firſt Centuries after Chriſt owned not, but refuted and condemn'd it.

Ex hac ſimilitudine plerumque etiam ipſarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Compare Quæſt. in Levit. lib. 3. cap. 57. *Sicut ſcriptum eſt, ſeptem ſpicæ ſeptem anni ſunt. Non enim dixit ſeptem annos ſignificant.*

I know very well that many things are objected againſt us out of the Fathers, that *Ignatius, Juſtin Martyr* and *Irenæus* affirm, that the Bread and Wine in the holy Euchariſt is the Body, fleſh and bloud of Chriſt; yea, as *Cyprian* and Saint *Ambroſe*

Ambroſe declare, That they *are changed*, tho not in ſhew or Effigies, yet in Nature; that they remain what they were, and are changed into another thing. To all which in brief I anſwer, That we queſtion not the truth of him that ſaid, *This is my Body*. We unfeignedly grant it is ſo, *ſecundum quendam modum*, as *Auguſtin* above, in a true and ſacramental, tho not literal and proper ſenſe. We undoubtedly believe on Saint *Paul's* infallible Authority, that the Rock in the Wilderneſs of which the *Iſraelites* drank was Chriſt; he ſaith not, as Saint *Auguſtin* ſomewhere obſerves, it ſignify'd Chriſt, but it was Chriſt; yet no man is ſo ſimple as to underſtand thoſe words not in a figurative and improper but a proper and literal ſenſe. Furthermore, we grant with *Cyprian* that the Bread and Wine are not changed in outward ſhew, yet in Nature (taking the word Nature in a general ſenſe, as when we ſay, a man becoming more kind and civil, he is grown better natur'd.) In regard of common bread and wine they are chang'd and converted into an holy Sacrament, wherein we have Communion with, or real, tho ſpitual, communication of the body and bloud of Chriſt. In like manner, we ſubſcribe to that of *Ambroſe*, That they remain what they are, *i. e.* as to ſubſtance, (which directly overthrows Tranſubſtantiation) and yet are changed into other things as to uſe and quality. When in and by the Reſurrection a natural, mortal and corruptible body is turned into a ſpiritual and immortal one, we all grant the nature of it is changed; yet no good Chriſtian will deny but that it remains for ſubſtance the very ſame body.

De cœna Domini. *De Sacram.* Epiſt. 23. *Petra erat Chriſtus. Non dixit Petra ſignificat Chriſtum*, &c. Quæſtiones in Levitic. l. 3. c. 37.

I know alſo our Adverſaries much urge the ſayings of *Hilary* and *Cyril of Alex. That by vertue of the Euchariſt Chriſt's body and blood is corporally and naturally united to us.* But this is impertinently alledg'd; for they ſpeak not of the Union of Chriſt's Body and Bloud to the outward Elements of Bread and Wine, but to the ſouls and bodies of all faithful Communicants, and to them onely, who thereby become bone of his bone and fleſh of his fleſh. In a word. As the Fathers ſay, Chriſt's Body is in us, ſo that our bodies are in him; not onely by Faith and Charity, but in very deed. And *Auguſtin.* Tract. 1. in Epiſt. Joann. *Sicut Chriſtus in nobis hic, ita nos ibi in illo ſumus.*

Lib. 6. de Trin. in *Concil. Epheſ.* *V. Ambroſe de Sacram.* l. 4. c. 4.

if it be ſo, that our ſubſtance is not turn'd into Chriſt's ſubſtance, why ſhould we think that the ſubſtance of the bread muſt be changed into the ſubſtance of Chriſt's body? Or his body ſhould be any more corporally in our body than our body is in his?

Laſtly, They vehemently preſs the ſayings of *Chryſoſtom* and other of the Fathers in their popular Homilies who ſay, in the holy Sacrament, *we ſee, touch and eat Chriſt's body, that our tongues are made red with his bloud, even that bloud which did flow from his ſide on the Croſs, that what he ſuffer'd* not on the Croſs he ſuffers in the Sacrament, *viz. his body to be broken with our teeth. Doſt thou ſee Bread and Wine in the Sacrament? Think it not.* In like manner *Cyril* of *Jeruſ. Myſtag.* But ſuch Hyperbolical expreſſions uſed by the Fathers to ſtir up devotion and preſerve an high reverence of the Sacrament in the minds of their Hearers are not to be taken, as our Adverſaries well know, in a ſtrict, literal and dogmatical ſenſe. No Papiſt according to his own principles can rationally hold, that Chriſt's body is corporally preſſed, pierc'd or touch'd by mens teeth, or that their tongues are dyed red with his bloud, ſeeing they affirm that Chriſt's Body is there, *incruentè*, in an unbloudy manner; inſomuch that they acknowledge thoſe words in *Berengarius* his Recantation, tho drawn up by the Pope, *viz. That Chriſt's fleſh in the Sacrament is ſenſually preſs'd or torn by mens teeth,* muſt be cautiouſly underſtood, not of Chriſt's Body, but of the outward Species or Elements onely, leſt we fall into a worſe Errour, than that he retracted.

Hom. 83. in Matth. Hom. 63. in Matth. Hom. 60. *ad Populum Antiochen.* Hom. 45. in Joann. Hom. 24. in 1. Epiſt. ad Corinth. *Vid. Aug.*

Autor Gloſſæ in Decret.

Secondly, I anſwer, That the Fathers uſe the like Rhetocal or Hyperbolical expreſſions in their popular Diſcourſes concerning Baptiſm; wherein neither we nor our Adverſaries admit of any Tranſubſtantiation. Thus *Tertullian* in his Book of Baptiſm ſaith, that thereby we are *dyed in the paſſion or bloud of our Lord.* In like manner *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem*, after he had inſtructed Chriſtians not to look upon the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament as mere Bread and Wine, what-

Cap 19. *Paſſio Domini in qua tingimur.*

Myſtag. 4. *In Sacramentis, non quid ſint, ſed quid oſtendant, attenditur; quoniam ſigna ſunt rerum aliud exiſtentia & aliud ſignificantia.* Aug. cont. Max. l. 3. c. 22. *Ne quis attendat in eis quod ſunt*, &c. *de Doctr. Chriſt.* c. 7. Hom. 16. *in Sacram. Euchar.* Tom. 6.

ever

ever ſenſe ſuggeſteth, but as the body and bloud of Chriſt, affirmeth the ſame of the Water in Baptiſm, that it is not λιτὸς καὶ ψιλὸς mere or bare Water, and the ſame he ſaith of the Oil in Chriſm, though neither of them are ſubſtantially chang'd into the very bloud of Chriſt. Many more inſtances might be added, but theſe may ſuffice. I will onely take notice of a Similitude uſed by St. *Chryſoſtom*, in which *Bellarmin* triumphs. 'Tis this: *As*, ſaith he, *Wax ſet on fire loſeth its ſubſtance being turn'd into fire, ſo by conſecration the ſubſtance of the* bread *is chang'd into the fleſh of Chriſt.* To which, and the like expreſſions quoted out of the Fathers, I ſhall anſwer in the words of *Petavius* the Jeſuit: *There are many things*, ſaith he, *in the Holy Fathers, eſpecially in* Chryſoſtom, *ſcatter'd here and there in their Homilies, which if you would reduce to the rule of exact Truth, they will ſeem altogether void of good ſenſe:* Another of their own Church ingenuouſly aknowledgeth that Preachers, ſuch as the Fathers were in their Homilies and popular Diſcourſes, often ſpeak things by an Hyperbole, being carried away, *affectuum impetu & orationis curſu*, with the heat of their affections; *which often*, ſaith he, *befell Chryſoſtom.* Yea, Saint *Hierom* confeſſes of himſelf, We have play'd the Rhetoricians in a Declamatory way. To cloſe this. Similitudes are the weakeſt kind of Arguments. Neither may our Adverſaries in prudence urge this ſimilitude of fired Wax too vehemently againſt us. If ſo; they muſt neceſſarily grant, that not onely the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament ceaſeth to be, but the very outward accidents alſo. For when Wax is fired, not onely the ſubſtance but the very accidents are different from what they were before. And ſo much at preſent for Tranſubſtantiation.

In Epiphanium, pag. 244. & pag. 288.

Sixtus Senenſis lib. 6. Biblioth. Annotat. 152.

Rhetoricati ſumus & aliquid declamationibus dedimus.

I paſs to the next Article, Purgatory. The Antient Fathers for five hundred years after Chriſt, did not hold the Romiſh Doctrine of Purgatory as an Article of Faith; yea, ſome of them expreſly contradict it. I will begin with the *Greek* Fathers. *Clemens Romanus* and *Ignatius* in their genuine Writings take no notice at all of it.

3. Art. Concerning Purgatory.

Juſtin Martyr denies it. *We believe*, ſaith he, ἕκαστον, *every man after his departure hence goeth according to his works either into everlaſting puniſhment or life.* And immediately addeth. Men *would*

ἐπ' αἰωνίαν κόλασιν ἢ σωτηρίαν.

would avoid ſin, if they conſider'd that they muſt go (without Repentance) *into eternal puniſhment by fire.* But of enduring temporal puniſhment for ſin by fire, not a word is to be found in all his Writings. Amongſt the Queſtions and Anſwers which are printed with his Works, it is thus reſolved. *After the departure of Souls out of their Bodies* εὐθὺς, *preſently, they are by Angels* carried to places fit for them; *the Souls of the juſt to Paradiſe, of the unjuſt to Hell, in which places they are kept until the Reſurrection.* Here no notice is taken of Purgatory or any middle or third place out of which Souls may be deliver'd by Prayers, Maſſes, Indulgences, *&c.* It's true, this Writer is much younger than *Juſtin Martyr*, but it maketh the more againſt our Adverſaries; for it ſheweth that long after his death this Article of *Roman* Faith was not Catholick or univerſally received.

Queſt. 75.

In *Irenæus*, (as *Eraſmus* alſo hath obſerv'd who was very well ſeen in his Writings) there is no mention of Purgatory, but in the cloſe of his laſt Book there is ſomewhat contradicting it, for without any diſtinction of Perſons or ſins, mortal or venial; he declares his opinion, that the Souls of all Chriſt's Diſciples go to one inviſible place, (*hades*) there remaining till the Reſurrection, as *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Lactantius*, *Ambroſe* and other of the Fathers held, which is inconſiſtent with Purgatory as invocation of dead Saints alſo, and contradicted by the *Romaniſts*.

Origen. Hom. 18. in *Jeremiam*, pag. 163. edit. *Huet.* *Dum hic ſumus, remedium non poſtea.*

Euſebius Cæſarienſis hath written ſeveral Volumes, in all which, as *Scultetus* hath noted, there is not the leaſt mention of Purgatory. It's true, he relates how the people pray'd for the Soul of *Conſtantine*. But *Conſtantine*, as he aſſures us in the next Chapter, went not to Purgatory, but was taken up to his God, and joined his divine part, his Soul, to God; yea, a little before his death, he himſelf, as *Euſebius* reports, uſed theſe words, *Now I know my ſelf to be happy, to be now accounted worthy of eternal life.* Prayer then for the dead doth not neceſſarily infer Purgatory. I grant, he reporteth *Plato*'s opinion concerning purgation of a middle ſort of men by temporal puniſhments after death. But adds, that *Plato*, through ignorance of the Scripture erred in many things.

Vita Conſtant. lib. 4. 63.

De Præp. Evang. lib. 11. c. 20. lib. 13.

I paſs to *Athanaſius*, in all whoſe Writings, tho many and large, I can find no mention of this Article of Faith, Purgatory;

gatory; and am the more confirm'd it cannot be found, in regard *Bellarmin* quotes nothing out of him or *Euſebius* againſt us.

Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration *in Cæſarium*, delivers himſelf thus, *I am mov'd by the ſayings of the Wiſe, that every Soul that is belov'd of God* (as the Souls ſent by *Romaniſts* to Purgatory are acknowledg'd to be) *preſently* εὐθὺς, *after the looſing from the body and departure hence, that which darkned the mind, being either purged or caſt from it or done away, in what ſort I cannot well expreſs*, (whence it's evident he believed not they were purged by fire, as *Romaniſts* peremptorily affirm) *beginneth ſenſibly to diſcern that good which remaineth for it, to be filled with wonderful delight, and to leap for joy.* But this wonderful delight and joy cannot conſiſt with Purgatory torments, or the fear of them. *Nazianzen* then was no Papiſt in this point. On thoſe words, *Ye ſhall carry out nothing until the morning*, &c. He ſaith, *Beyond or after this night*, i. e. *after death, there is no purging*; if no purging, no Purgatory. In another place he ſaith, *After this life is a time of puniſhment, but not of purging.* Hence he adds, *It is better for a man to be chaſtis'd and purg'd by temporal affliction here.* All which places directly confront the *Romiſh* Doctrine concerning purgation of Souls by fire after death. In his fourth Oration on Baptiſm he mentions ſeveral ſorts of fire: *I know*, ſaith he, *the purging fire*, viz. that which Chriſt came to ſend on Earth, *viz.* the fire of Tribulation and temporal Affliction, as *Nicetas* in his Comment underſtands it. *The fire of love and faith towards God which purgeth the Soul from ſin. Therefore*, ſaith he, *Chriſt deſired to have it kindled on Earth as ſoon as might be that we might have the benefit of it.* This cannot be Purgatory-fire which Chriſt kindled not on Earth. *I know*, ſaith he, *another fire*; *but it is a puniſhing, not purging fire, as that of* Sodom, *or that which goeth before the face of the Lord to burn up his Enemies*, or the fire *join'd with the never-dying worm, which is eternal.* Had *Nazianzen* known any other fire purgative of Souls after this life, no queſtion he would here have mention'd it; but he was it ſeems wholly ignorant of this *Romiſh* Purgative fire after death, which *Bellarmine* aſſerts to be a point of Faith, which he that believeth not cannot

Oratio 10.

Orat. de Paſchate, Οὐκοῦν τὴν νύκτα ταύτην ὅτι τις καθαρσις. Ἐὰν δὲ μετὰ τὴν νύκτα, οὐκέτι καθαρσις.

De Purgat. l. 10. c. 15. cannot be ſaved, but ſhall go to Hell. *Parcite, non credimus.* However to make a ſhew of *Nazianzen*'s conſent, he quoteth thoſe words in his *Oration, In Sancta lumina, They ſhall be baptiz'd with another fire, which is the laſt Baptiſm —— which devours the groſs matter like fire, and conſumeth the levity of ſin.* But herein the Cardinal diſcovers much want of ſincerity and fair dealing, for *Nazianzen* in that place ſpeaketh thus Τυχὸν ἔχει. *By chance,* or *it may be,* they ſhall be *there* baptiz'd with fire; ſo that he delivers it not poſitively as an Article of Faith, but as an uncertain Opinion or poſſibility onely, as *Auguſtin* doth after him. Again, he directs his Speech to the *Novatian* Hereticks. But the *Roman* Church is not ſo merciful as to ſend Hereticks to Purgatory, and poſſibly he might mean by that Fire, the fire of Conflagration at the end of the World; as others of the Fathers, (which *Bellarmin* denies not) are ſometimes to be underſtood.

Origen. cont. *Celſ.* l. 5. *Cyril. Catech.* 15.

Moral. ſum. lib. 10. I muſt not omit his intimate Friend *Baſil* the Great, who ſaith, *The preſent time is the time of repentance and remiſſion of ſins.* In his Exhortation to Baptiſm, he mentions only Heaven and Hell taking no notice of Purgatory. By the Baptiſm of Fire he underſtands λόγῳ διδασκαλίας, the word of Doctrine. In his Comment on *Pſal.* 33. he diſtinguiſheth two ſorts of men onely, ſuch as are dead to ſin and die in a mortify'd and ſanctify'd Eſtate, and ſuch as are ſinners. The death of the former is bleſſed, of the latter, miſerable, in regard puniſhment attends them like *Dives* in the Parable: Now *Dives,* we know, was in Hell, as is plain, *Luke* 16. not Purgatory. *Baſil* therefore it ſeemeth knew no ſuch place.

Her. 59. I paſs to *Epiphanius,* who confuting the *Novatians,* writeth thus: *In the other World after mens death there is no Faſting, Pennance, Alms or Piety; there* Lazarus *cometh not to* Dives, *nor* Dives *to* Lazarus. (Why did he not except thoſe who are labouring in Purgatory, as *Romaniſts* ſpeak?) *Epiphanius* goes on; *The Store-houſes are ſealed, no coming out, the time accompliſhed, the Combat ended, the Race run, and the Crowns are given,* (To what end then are Prayers, Maſſes, Indulgences, *&c?*) *and they who have ſtriven are quiet.* If quiet, how labouring in Purgatory? Again, *All things are plainly ended after death; whilſt all are in Combate, after falling there may be riſing again. There is yet hope, there is yet help —— Sal-*

vation

vation is not deſperate. After death the King ſhuts the door, admitteth none. After our departure we may not correct what was amiſs formerly in us. How are theſe words reconcileable to the modern *Romans* Faith? They ſay, men may correct after death, by the help of others, what was formerly amiſs in them. After death Salvation is not deſperate, there is yet hope and help for ſome of a middle ſort when they have undergone temporary puniſhment or penance in Purgatory. The door of Heaven after death is not ſhut, the Store-houſes are not ſeal'd up, but may be open'd afterward; the Combate is not ended, nor, (whatſoever *Epiphanius* ſaith) all the Crowns yet given, ſome being reſerv'd for thoſe that are making ſatisfaction, for their venial ſins or compleating it for thoſe that were mortal in Purgatory. Yet the Fathers are all theirs, and the *Roman* Church never did, never can, err.

But it's objected, that *Epiphanius* undoubtedly held Purgatory as a point of Faith, in regard he alloweth Prayers for the dead, and condemns *Aërius* as an Heretick for denying it.

I anſwer, Prayer for the dead doth no way prove the *Romiſh* Purgatory. Or that they for whom the Church anciently prayed were in pain or torment; neither doth *Epiphanius* intimate any ſuch thing, yea he contradicts it in part at leaſt, when he ſaith, *We pray for the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, Martyrs*; who, as our Adverſaries confeſs, were never in Purgatory, but happy in the Lord. Saint *Ambroſe* pray'd for the Emperour *Valentinian* when deceaſed, yet in the very ſame place he declares that he believ'd he was in heavenly Glory: Saint *Auguſtin* alſo pray'd for his Mother *Monica* when departed; yet immediately adds, that he believ'd God had granted what he begg'd, *i.e.* remiſſion of her ſins and everlaſting life. Prayer then for the dead does not infer Purgatory. But this by the way.

De Obitu Valentin. *Confeſſ.* lib. 9. cap. ult.

Let us now hear what Saint *Chryſoſtom* ſaith in his third Sermon upon the *Philippians*, he makes not three, but onely two ſorts of Chriſtians; Such as die in the true Faith, and ſuch as die in Infidelity and their Sins. The former after their departure out of this life are bleſſed, who are gone to Chriſt, and there are nearer to him, not by Faith, but face to face. And Homily the fourth on the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*,

Ὅτι τῶν πόνων ἀπήλλαξε καὶ τῆς θελίας ὀμβαλῶν ἔχει παρ' ἑαυτῷ.

Tell me what mean those bright Lamps in Funerals? Is it not that we bring forth the dead like victorious Combatants? Why are the Hymns? Is it not because we glorifie God, for crowning him that is departed, ἀπηλλάντα, that he hath free'd him from labours and from the fear of death, having him with himself? Consider what ye sing when ye say, Return unto thy Rest, O my soul, &c. These expressions agree with Purgatory like Water with Fire. How are they blessed with Christ, victorious, crowned, free from all sorrows, at rest and peace, who being of the number of the faithful, no gross sinners, but in a state of Grace, are yet tormented in the fiery flames of Purgatory. The same Father in another place hath these words, *He that in this present life shall not wash away his sins, shall find no consolation hereafter; this is the time of combating, that, of crowning.* I shall onely add what he writeth in his second Homily upon *Lazarus*, quoted by *Bellarmin*, *When we are departed hence it is not in our power to repent, or to wash away the sins we have committed.* Thus we have seen that the *Greek* Fathers in the first Ages of the Church were not of the present *Roman* Faith as to this new Article of Purgatory. I might descend lower were it not needless; for 'tis confess'd by some of the *Romish* Writers, particularly *Roffensis* the Pope's Martyr in *Henry* VIII. his days, *That in the ancient Fathers, especially the* Greeks, *there is either none, or very rare, mention of Purgatory. Neither*, saith he, *did the* Latin *Fathers all at once receive it, neither does the* Greek *Church at this day believe it.* This Concession is true; for the *Greeks* in their printed Confession offer'd to the Council of *Basil*, *Jeremy* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in his Censure of the *Lutheran* Confession, and *Cyril* Patriarch of that Church in his Confession of Faith, sent by him to *Cornelius Hage* Ambassadour for the States of *Holland* at *Constantinople*, An. 1630. deny any purgation of sins after death by fire in Purgatory, which, say the *Greeks* in their Apology, was condemn'd by the fifth General Council, altho it is not now to be found in the late Editions of the Councils.

Hom. 5. in Genesin.

V. Cyril. Alexand. in Joan. lib. 12. c. 36.

V. Polyd. Virg. de invent. rerum. lib. 8. c. 1. *Alph. de Castro* c. 8. p. 572.

Ann. 1438.

From what hath been said I hope it is evident, First, That there neither is nor ever was any Catholick or universal consent of all Christian Churches as to this new *Roman* Article of Faith, *viz.* Purgatory. Secondly, That *Bellarmin* the

Jesuit

Jeſuit doth but abuſe the World in quoting the *Greek* Fathers as owning it. For, is it probable that the *Romans* ſhould underſtand their meaning in their Writings better than themſelves?

It's true, ſome of them, as *Origen*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, &c. mention Purgation of Souls from ſin by Fire, but it makes nothing for the Popiſh doctrine of Purgatory. For Firſt, *Origen*'s Purgatory is univerſal, which all, Prophets, Apoſtles, the bleſſed Virgin, muſt paſs through; not ſome onely, neither very good nor very bad, but of a middle ſort, as *Romaniſts* hold. Secondly, The Purgation, Saint *Baſil*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, and others ſpeak of, is not before the Reſurrection, but at the end of the World, by the fire of Conflagration, which ſhall purge, as ſome think, the whole Creation, ſo that at laſt all men, even Devils too, ſhall be ſaved, as *Origen* held, who turn'd Hell into Purgatory. Such Sentences of the Fathers will not at all be ſerviceable to our Adverſaries purpoſe. So much for the *Greek*; come we now to the *Latin* Fathers.

Origen. in Exod. Hom. 6.

V. Origen in lib. Regum. p. 36. *Contra Celſum*, lib. 5. p. 241. *Cyrilli Catech.* l. 15. pag. 168.

Ego puto quod & poſt reſurrectionem ex mortuis indigeamus ſacramento nos eluente & purgante. Origen. Hom. 14. in Lucam.

I ſhall begin with *Tertullian*, who in his *Apologetick*, Cap. 47. mentions onely two places to which Souls go, Hell and Paradiſe. In his Book *De Teſtimon. Animæ* Cap. 4. He thus beſpeaketh the Soul: *We affirm thee to remain after death, and to expect the day of judgment; and according to your behaviour to be deſtinated to torment or comfort*; and both *eternal*. As for temporary torments in the fire of Purgatory before the day of Judgment, *Tertullian* takes no notice of them. In his fifth Book againſt *Marcion*, Cap. 6. commenting on that famous place, 1 *Cor.* 3. he rightly underſtandeth the Gold, Silver, Hay, Stubble, not of ſins venial or mortal, but Doctrines worthy or unworthy of the foundation, *i.e.* Chriſt or Chriſtian Religion, with whom agrees *Clemens Alex.* in his fourth Book Cap. 34. againſt *Marcion*, as alſo *De Anima* Cap. 35. 55. he ſaith, The Souls *of all good Chriſtians are in* Abraham's *boſom*, in refrigerio, *a place of refreſhment until the Reſurrection* (as many of the ancient Fathers thought)

Expectare diem Judicii proque meriſto aut cruciatui deſtinari, aut refrigerio utroque ſempiterno.

Strom 5. τὰ τῶν αἱρέσεων ἐξαναθήματα.

thought) *when they ſhall receive* plenitudinem mercedis, *the fulneſs of their reward*; Not, as Papiſts now teach, any of them in Purgatorian torments. It is farther obſervable, that he there diſtinguiſheth that place from Hell or any part of it, as Purgatory is ſuppoſed to be. And diſcourſing on thoſe words apply'd by *Romaniſts* to Purgatory, *Thou ſhalt not come out thence till thou haſt paid the uttermoſt farthing*; He affirmeth, that all Souls abide *apud inferos*, till the Reſurrection. Which utterly overthrows the *Roman* Doctrine of Purgatory and renders all their Maſſes, Indulgences, *&c*, vain and unprofitable.

Ad æternæ mortis vel immortalitatis hoſpitia dividamur, p. 166.

From the Maſter let us paſs to his Scholar Saint *Cyprian*, who in his Epiſtle to *Demetrian*, ſaith, that at the ending of this temporal life we are ſevered into the receptacles either of *eternal death* or *immortality*. And in his Book *De bono mortalitatis*, he comforts the Chriſtians generally in a time of raging Peſtilence with theſe conſiderations: That the ſervants of Chriſt when they die, depart, as *Simeon* deſired, *in peace. Enter into Paradiſe, go to Chriſt, begin to reign with Chriſt, that when they are taken out of the ſtorms of this World they gain the haven of Reſt and eternal ſecurity*. Laſtly, *That after death the righteous are call'd* ad refrigerium *to refreſhment*; (not torment in Purgatory fire whither ſome are ſent by the *Romaniſts*) and the *unrighteous to puniſhment*. All which expreſſions are utterly inconſiſtent with this new Article of Faith; as every man not blinded with prejudice may eaſily diſcern. To the ſame purpoſe in his Epiſtle to *Antonium*; he adviſeth, in contradiction to the bitter doctrine of *Novatus*, that pardon and peace ſhould be granted to Penitents *in extremis*, at or a little before their death; *Becauſe*, ſaith he, *apud inferos exomologeſis fieri non poſſet, in Hell or the ſtate of death, or in the grave (as the word* Inferi *is ſometimes taken) there can be no ſatisfaction made by ſuffering penance or puniſhment for ſin*. It's true, in the latter end of the ſame Epiſtle, he ſaith, It's one thing to be preſently admitted to the reward of Faith or heavenly Glory, and another to be purged from ſins by being long tormented in fire. But this teſtimony is no good proof of the *Roman* Purgatory, in regard he there ſpeaketh expreſly *De die judicii*, of the day of Judgement after the Reſurrection; whereas our Adverſaries confeſs,

Securitatis æternæ portum petimus.

confeſs, that their Purgatory Fire is of no uſe after the Reſurrection and eternal Judgment. The like ſaying he hath in his Epiſtle to *Demetrian.* After we have gone out of this life, *nullus remanet ſatisfactionis locus*; *There is no place for ſatisfying for our ſins. Here life is got or loſt for ever.* Our Adverſaries ſay, after we are gone out of this World we may by ſuffering in Purgatory fully ſatisfie God for our ſins, compleat our *Exomologeſis* or Penance, obtaining thereby at laſt life eternal. Surely Saint *Cyprian* was of another opinion.

Come we to *Lactantius. The Heathens,* ſaith he, *ſpeak of a* Bivium *two ways,* apud inferos, *relating to the dead*; *which more truly ſay, that theſe two ways are Heaven and Hell, for to the righteous immortality, to the wicked eternal death belongs.* Here *Lactantius* mentions two, not three ways, men go after death. Inſtit. lib. 6. c. 3. & lib. 3. c. 19. *Cæls & inferorum.*

The next *Latin* Father is Saint *Hilary,* who in his Comment on *Matth.* overthroweth the main ground on which Purgatory is built; for he ſaith, expounding the Parable of the Virgins, *Alienis meritis ac operibus neminem adjuvandum* &c. *that no man after this life can be helped or deliver'd by the good works or merits of others, becauſe every man muſt neceſſarily provide Oil for his own Lamp.* The wiſe Virgins in Saint *Hilary*'s judgment are they, who embracing the opportunity or ſeaſon of this life, the time of repentance and reconciliation with God, prepare themſelves for Chriſt's coming. The fooliſh are they who would be borrowing Oil of their Neighbours, provide not in time for themſelves, but depend on the courteſie of others, their Works, Prayers, Merits, which will ſtand them in no ſtead, when being out of their bodies they have neglected and loſt the time of repentance. If *Hilary* was in the right, redemption of Souls out of Purgatory by other mens Prayers, Merits, Faſtings, by Indulgences, Maſſes, Pardons, Scapularies, and ſuch fooliſh inventions, are all vain and inſignificant, which will ſtand men in no ſtead, yield them no help or relief. The ſame Father elſewhere maketh only two ſorts of men *Fideles & Impii, faithful and impious*; *The former,* he ſaith, *going out of the body are placed in* Abraham's *boſom, where they are kept free from evil,* viz. of puniſhment, *till after the reſurrection* (ſo he thought) *they be admitted into Heaven*; *the other are hindred like* Dives C. 27. In Pſal. p. 120.

by

by the interposing Gulf from going thither. To the same purpose he discourseth in *Psalm* 2.

I pass to Saint *Ambrose*, who in his Book *De Bono Mortis*, Cap. 2. saith thus: *He that receiveth not here remission of sins shall not be there*, i. e. in Heaven. He speaketh indefinitely of all sins whether mortal or venial. And again, Cap. 12. *When that day*, viz. of death, *cometh, they go to their Redeemer, to the very bosom of* Abraham, *a place* of rest, not torment, speaking of good Christians. Certainly, it is harsh to affirm that justify'd persons reconcil'd to God by Christ's bloud, (for as *Hilary* even now taught us, this must be done here in this life or no where) and consequently in a state of Grace and favour with him, should in regard of some small venial sins or mortal, as they are called, not fully satisfy'd for in this life by Penance, Fasting, Alms, *&c.* be cast into fiery torments, and to lie there many years, none know how long, unless helped out by the uncertain Prayers, Merits, *&c.* of others; particularly unless the allsufficient and abundantly satisfactory Merits of Christ be applyed to them by the Popes Indulgences.

I add next Saint *Hierom*, who saith, When the Soul freed In Amos cap. 9. from the bands of the body shall have liberty to fly whither it will, or whither it is compell'd to go, *It shall either be carried to Hell, of which it is written*, In Hell who will confess to thee? *or it shall be lifted up to Heaven.* It seemeth a third place, *viz.* Purgatory, *Hierom* knew not.

I will end with Saint *Augustin*, who having mention'd Heaven and Hell, adds, *A third place we are altogether ignorant of, neither do we find it in holy Scripture.* Elsewhere he *Hypognost.* lib. 5. saith, *There is no middle place to any, that he should not be with* *De Pecc. mer. & remiss.* c. 28. *the Devil, who is not with Christ.* In his Epistle to *Hesychius*, Epist. 80. he writeth thus: *In what state the day of death findeth any one, accordingly shall he be judged at the last day.* The like In Dial. *p.* 107. Sentence almost word for word we find in *Justin Martyr*, who quoteth it as a saying of our Saviour, *In what things I find you, so will I judge you.* In his Epistle to *Macedonius*, he saith, *After this life there is no place to correct our manners or what hath been amiss.* How then can Repentance or temporal satisfaction for sins be perfected or supply'd after death? I will add his words upon the 31. *Psalm*, *If God pardon sins, he will cover them; if he cover them, he will not take notice*

of

of them, if he will not take notice of them, he will not puniſh them. How is this reconcileable with Gods puniſhing the ſins that he hath pardon'd, in Purgatory? It's true, We know God puniſheth ſometimes in this life ſuch as he pardons, for their future amendment and for example to others; but what is this to puniſhing men after this life, when there is no amendment poſſible, as our Adverſaries grant, nor others to be thereby warned?

I acknowledge there are ſome places quoted by *Bellarmin* and others, wherein St. *Auguſtin* ſeemeth to own Purgation of the Souls of ſome men from ſin after this life, as *De Geneſi lib.* 2. *contr. Manich.* Cap. 10. *de Civit. Dei, lib.* 21. *cap.* 24. Altho *Ludovicus Vives* ſaith, the place is not to be found in the antient Manuſcripts, nor in that printed at *Friburge, Hom.* 16. *inter* 50. *in Pſalm* 37. Comment. *in locum.*

But in his *Enchiridion*, his Book *De fide & operibus*, and *Ad Dulcitium*, where he profeſſedly handles this Point, and expoundeth the principal place of Scripture now urged by *Romaniſts* for their Doctrine of Purgatory; he ſpeaketh very doubtfully and uncertainly. Firſt, He acknowledgeth that 1 *Cor.* 3. is difficult and obſcure, one of thoſe intimated by Saint *Paul*, 2 *Epiſt. Cap.* 3. *ver.* 16. of the true meaning of which he was not certain. But ſuch an obſcure place is, as all will grant, a very unfit ground to build an Article of Faith upon, which to deny ſhall be Hereſie and deſtructive of Salvation. Secondly, To *Dulcitius*, quoting his own Books before-mention'd, he interprets it expreſly *De igne doloris*, of the figurative and metaphorical Fire of grief, (according to *Pſalm* 39. *My heart was hot within me, at laſt the fire kindled*, &c.) ariſing from the loſs of temporal enjoyments, as Eſtate, Wealth, &c. too earneſtly loved, yet renounced, and with ſome reluctancy forſaken for Chriſt's ſake and the Goſpels. Such a man, ſaith St. *Auguſtine*, is *ſaved, yet as it were by fire*, urit enim eum dolor, *for grief burneth him*, as *Latin* Authors ſpeak. So that by *Fire* in that place, 1 *Cor.* 3. This learned Father did not, ſo far as I can perceive, underſtand any proper and material fire but Metaphorical onely. Then he immediately adds, Whether therefore in this life only men ſuffer theſe things, *i. e* as I ſaid before, this figurative fire of grief, or alſo after this life ſome ſuch *judicia*, judgments

or

or punishments follow the sense of Saint *Pauls* words, *quantum arbitror*, as I think abhors not from truth. So that Saint *Austin* doth not peremptorily assert it as a point of Catholick Faith to be believed necessarily to Salvation, that there is any such, to wit, grief after this life, but leaveth it uncertain, and delivereth it as his opinion onely. Thirdly, It is worthy of our observation, that they who held (amongst whom Saint *Jerom* was one) that all Christians, not Hereticks or Schismaticks) who professed faith in Christ should, how wickedly soever they had lived and died be at last saved (an Opinion detested by Saint *Austin*, and earnestly confuted by him in several places of his Works) did bring this very Text, 1 *Cor.* 3. to prove it. *He that buildeth on this foundation*, i. e. faith in Christ and the profession of it, *wood, hay, stubble*, i. e. a wicked and barren life, *shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* Saint *Austin* labouring to bring men off from this dangerous Error so plainly contradicted by the Holy Scripture in many places, is sometimes not unwilling to grant, that it is possible that some of the weaker sort of Christians departing out of this life under the guilt of some lesser sins might be purged *some way or other* from them after this life, (which the *Greeks* at this day, who deny the *Romish* Purgatory, grant) but he is far from believing or urging it on others as an Article of Catholick Faith, of which to be sure he would never have spoken in so doubting and uncertain a manner; neither will any learned man deny but that some of the Ancient Fathers, as Saint *Chrysostom*, St. *Jerom*, with others noted by *Sixtus Senensis* were of Opinion that men dying grosly wicked, yea and Devils too, saith *Origen*, should at last be saved, or might at least have their punishment in Hell mitigated by the Prayers and Alms of their surviving Friends, which Tenet is now condemned even by the Papists themselves. Fourthly, It is considerable that Saint *Austin ad Dulcitium* expresly affirmeth, that the Fire mentioned 1 *Cor.* 3. is such, as not onely he that buildeth on the foundation *Wood, Hay, Stubble*, but also he that buildeth or layeth on Gold, Silver, precious Stones must pass through. For, Saint *Paul* immediately adds, the fire shall try *every mans* work: then he adds, *the tentation of tribulation, ignis est*, is fire, *i. e.* in a figurative and metaphorical sense, as it is written

In fine Comment. in Isaiam.

1 Cor. 6. 9, 10.

Forsitan verum est, lib. 21. *de Civit. Dei*, cap. 26.

Ergò utriusque opus probabit.

written, *Eccleſiaſticus* 27. *The Furnace trieth the Potters Veſſels, and juſt men the tentation of tribulation,* which he explains thus: He that mindeth the things of this life, (1 *Cor.*7. careth too much for them) if yet for Chriſt's ſake he be at laſt willing to forſake them, ſhall be ſaved, but *quaſi per ignem,* as it were by fire, *quia urit eum dolor rerum quas dilexerat amiſſarum, ſed non ſubvertit neque conſumit fundamenti ſtabilitate munitum & incorruptum; becauſe the grief of the beloved things he hath loſt burneth him, but ſubverts or conſumes him not being preſerved incorrupt by the ſtability of the foundation;* to wit, Faith in Chriſt: Then he adds, *Tale aliquid,* &c. *ſome ſuch thing* (i. e. burning in the fire of grief, for of it he before ſpake) *to happen alſo after this life, non incredibile eſt,* is not incredible. (He ſaith not, as *Bellarmin,* muſt be believed under peril of damnation,) and whether it be ſo or no, *quæri poteſt* may be enquired after, and either be found or lies hid, to wit, *that ſome* (not all) *of the faithful by a kind of Purgatory or Purgative fire* per ignem quendam purgatorium, (whether figurative or proper and material he reſolveth not) *by how much the more or leſs they have loved theſe periſhing good things, ſhall by ſo much the ſooner or later be ſaved, but not ſuch of whom it's ſaid by St.* Paul, *they ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God, unleſs they be pardoned here upon their true repentance.* 1 Cor. 6. 9. Can any ingenuous Perſon believe St. *Auſtin* took this Purgatory Doctrine, whatſoever it be, or our Adverſaries will have his meaning to be, for an undoubted Article of the Chriſtian Faith? Laſtly, St. *Auſtin* expoundeth that place the *Romaniſts* urge much in maintenance of their Purgatory. *Thou ſhalt not come out thence till thou haſt paid the uttermoſt farthing,* as Proteſtants do, that is, thou ſhalt never come out thence; as *donec,* until, is taken, *Matth.* 1. laſt; and in other places. So *Dulcitius* had interpreted that place, which S. *Auſtin* approveth of, and applieth to this preſent Controverſie. Matth. 5. 26.

From all that hath been ſaid I infer, Firſt, That the Fire mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 3. is not the Popiſh Purgatory fire, neither did Saint *Auſtin* ſo underſtand it. Secondly, That the true ſenſe of that place is, as he confeſſeth, very difficult, dark and obſcure. Thirdly, That whatſoever Saint *Auſtin* inferr'd from it, Whether that there is after this life a proper, or only a figurative fire of Grief, it is no part of the Antient Catho-

lick Faith, but a truth, if *a truth*, which a true Christian may be ignorant of without peril of damnation. *Quæri potest, It may be questioned or sought after, and possibly never be found out, but lie hid.* Fourthly, That therefore Saint *Austin* was no *Roman* Catholick, or of Pope *Pius*'s faith. I might add, that even Pope *Gregory* the Great confesseth that the Fire, 1 *Cor.* 3. may be understood of temporal affliction: but I shall not descend so low at this time.

Lib. quarto Dialog. cap. 39. *Apud Bellarm.* lib. 10. c. 5. *de Purgatorio.*

To these expres places quoted out of Saint *Austin*, *Bellarmin* replies, that he doubted not of Purgatory, but of the quality of the punishment and sins there to be purged.

But it's evident from his own words above recited: First, That he understood not the Fire mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 3. (the principal place alledged by our Adversaries) in a proper and natural sense as they do, but moral and Metaphorical, not of material but figurative Fire, the fire of Grief. The *Greeks* in their Apology deny not Pardon or purgation of some sins after death, tho not by material fire, for which nevertheless the *Romish* Church condemns them as Hereticks and rejecters of Purgatory. Secondly, It's undeniable that he did not hold the Purgation of sins after death, no not by the fire of Grief, much less material fire, to be an undoubted truth or Article of Christian Faith, as *Bellarmin* in that place affirmeth it to be.

De Purgat. lib. 10. cap. ult.

But in regard the words of Saint *Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Antonian* are much urged by some as clearly confirming the Romish Doctrine of Purgatory, where he writeth, *Aliud est statim fidei & virtutis mercedem accipere, aliud pro peccatis longo dolore cruciatum emendari & purgari diu igne: It's one thing presently to receive the reward of Faith and Vertue; another for one being long tormented with grief for his sins to be cleansed and purged a great while in fire.* To answer this place, we are first of all to observe the occasion of these words: Saint *Cyprian* a little before takes notice of an Objection of the *Novatian* Hereticks against the receiving the *Lapsi*, such as for fear in time of Persecution, like *Peter*, denied Christ. They alledged, that if such might be admitted to Absolution and the Communion of the Church, none would be Martyrs, or lay down their lives for the faith of Christ. Saint *Cyprian* answers, not so; for altho a time of Penance

Penance and then Peace, is granted to Adulterers, yet Virginity and Continency did not languiſh or decay in the Church. Then follow the words above mentioned, *Aliud eſt*, &c. It's evident enough then that the Fire here mentioned is not to be underſtood of any proper and material Purgatorian fire, which Papiſts plead for, but Metaphorical, or of the fire of Grief, as St. *Auſtin* expounds the Fire, 1 *Cor.* 3. which place moſt probably Saint *Cyprian* here alludes unto; in regard ſuch as fell away in time of Perſecution were not to be admitted to the peace of the Church until they had undergone the grief and ſhame of a publick, long and ſevere Penance, termed *Exomologeſis*. So much Saint *Cyprian*'s own words intimate: It's one thing preſently to receive, as Martyrs did, the reward of their Faith and Vertue (a great encouragement to Martyrdom) another to be cleanſed *longo dolore* with long grief, and (which are Paraphraſtical of his former words) to be long purged with fire. To this I ſhall add, that it was the Opinion of many of the Ancient Fathers, as *Irenæus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, *Ambroſe*, with others quoted by *Sixtus Senenſis*, that none except Martyrs were immediately upon their death admitted admitted to the preſence of God, *ad oſcula Domini*, to receive the Crown of Eternal Glory, but were kept *in loco inviſibili*, as *Irenæus*, or *in abditis receptaculis*, in ſome ſecret inviſible places until the day of Judgment, ſollicitouſly expecting then to receive their final Sentence; this is *pendere in die judicii ad ſententiam Domini*, as Saint *Cyprian* there phraſeth it.

As *Bellarmin* grants, *de Purgat.* lib. 1. cap. 5.

Biblioth. l. 6. annotat. 345.

Thus I hope I have given (let the *Learned* Reader judge) a true and fair interpretation of Saint *Cyprian*'s words, which do not import any proper fire to purifie Souls before the day of Judgment; ſo that upon the view of what is aboveſaid, we may conclude that the Romiſh Doctrine of Purgatory is no part of the Antient, Primitive and Apoſtolick Faith, but in the Fifth Century in Saint *Auſtin*'s days began to be a doubtful and uncertain Opinion only. So much at preſent for Purgatory.

I ſhould now make ſome enquiry in the Writings of the Antient Fathers after Indulgences, the fuel that feeds this Purgatorian Fire. But I am much diſcouraged in regard *Alphonſus de Caſtro* a learned and earneſt Papiſt, who lived near *Luther*'s time, and knew what was the firſt occaſion of his oppoſing the Church of *Rome*, to wit, the abominable abuſe of theſe Indulgences by the Pardon-mongers: He, I ſay, in that very Book which he wrote againſt Hereſies, and *Luther* by name hath informed me, *Inter omnes eſt*, &c. that amongſt all the Points in diſpute betwixt Proteſtants and Papiſts, there is not one which the Scripture hath leſs clearly delivered, and of which Antient Writers have ſpoken leſs than concerning Indulgences. The Popes Martyr *Roffenſis* confeſſeth the uſe of them was *ſero receptus in Eccleſia*, of late received by the Church. Of Purgatory, he ſaith, there is eſpecially amongſt the *Greek* Writers, *ferè nulla mentio*, almoſt no mention of it. Now Indulgences, as is granted, are grounded on Purgatory; they muſt ſtand and fall together. So long, ſaith he, as there was no care or fear of Purgatory no Man ſought for Pardons; for on it depends all the credit of Pardons: Take away Purgatory, and what uſe of Pardons? When therefore Purgatory was ſo lately known and received in the Church, who now can marvel at Pardons, that in the beginning of the Church there was no uſe of them. Pardons therefore began after that they had trembled a while at the pains of Purgatory. Thus he. *Antoninus, Sylveſter, Pierius, Oſtienſis*, the *Lovain Divines, Polydore Virgil, Cajetan*, and others, of whom more hereafter, ſay as much: ſo that it will be labour in vain to ſearch for them in the Writings of the antient Authors. Here I cannot but wonder our Adverſaries do not bluſh to boaſt of their preſent *Roman* Faith and Church, as if they were the ſame, only the ſame, with the antient Primitive and Catholick one, and to accuſe us Proteſtants of Novelty, Hereſie, and ſetting up a new Faith and Church under the Banner of *M. Luther*, whereas they, not we, are guilty of thoſe Crimes by introducing new Articles of Faith, Purgatory and Indulgences amongſt the reſt, which we only proteſt againſt.

Lib. 80. *Tit. Indulgentiæ. De Indulgentiis pauca dici poſſunt per certitudinem, quia nec Scriptura expreſsè de iis loquitur. Durand.* l. 4. diſt. 20. qu. 3. *Ambr. Hilar. Aug. Hieronym. minimè de iis loquuntur*, Idem. ibid. *Roffenſis* aſſert. *Luther.* confut. art. 18.

I now

I now come to *Invocation of Saints and Angels*, a grand Article of the *Roman* Faith according to Pope *Pius* his new Creed, concerning which I ſhall in general take the boldneſs to ſay, that for above three hundred years after Chriſt there cannot be produced out of the genuine Writings of one antient Father one clear and pertinent teſtimony for Invocation of Saints or Angels. Beſides my own little obſervation I have good Vouchers for this Aſſertion, to wit, the moſt Reverend and learned Primate *Uſher*, who read over all the Fathers, and Mr. *Mountague* in his Treatiſe of *Invocation of Saints*, yea *Cardinal Perron* acknowledgeth this to be truth, who (as alſo *Caſſander*) never uſed in private Devotions to pray to any Saint. As for the place uſually quoted out of *Juſtin M.* to this purpoſe, it is groſly perverted by falſe pointing. The words are theſe: *But him* (i. e. God the Father) *and him, who came from him and taught us and the Hoſt of good Angels theſe things, the Son, and the Prophetick Spirit we worſhip and adore.* *Bellarmine* was not aſhamed to render them thus: But him (the Father) and his Son, who came and taught us theſe things, and the Hoſt of good Angels, and the Prophetical Spirit we worſhip and adore. Thus by placing a note of diſtinction after διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, teaching us theſe things, he abuſeth his Reader into a conceit that the Primitive Chriſtians, as *Juſtin* here witneſſeth, did adore not only the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, but the Hoſt of Holy Angels alſo. Yea, if the Cardinals reading be right, then they worſhiped and adored the Holy Angels in the third place next to the Father and Son before the Holy and Prophetical Spirit; which certainly was far from the leaſt thought or practice of the Primitive Chriſtians or their Apologiſt *Juſtin Martyr*, who elſewhere declares in his own and the Chriſtians names that they worſhipped as the Father and Son; ſo *in the third place*, not the Holy Angels, but the *Holy Ghoſt*. But enough of this, only we may obſerve by the way, with what honeſty and fidelity our Adverſaries quote the Fathers.

Art. 4. Concerning Invocation of Saints.

Eximium adorationis genus. Bellarm. de Beat. Sanct.

V. Molinæum de Novit. Paſſ. p. 388. *apud Chemnit. in Exam.* p. 6.

13. Apol. 2.

ἐν τείτῃ τάξει.

There is another place they bring out of *Irenæus*, *Ut Maria Virgo ſit Evæ advocata*, *That the Virgin* Mary *may be* Eves *Advocate:* Hence moſt impertinently they infer, that *Eve* prayed or might pray to the Virgin *Mary*; whereas all that

Lib. 5. *cont. Hær. ultra medium.*

can

can be concluded from those words is, that the Virgin *Mary* prayeth for *Eve*. I wonder how it is possible to conceive that *Eve* should pray to the Virgin *Mary* some thousands of years before she was born. The truth is, those words of *Irenæus* do not at all relate to any religious Advocation or Invocation; for in that place he onely makes a Parallel or comparison betwixt *Eve* and the *Virgin Mary*, that as *Eve* a Virgin brought sin and death into the World, so *Mary* a Virgin brought forth a Saviour and Redeemer, *ut Maria sit Evæ advocata*, that *Mary* might be an *Advocate* or *Pleader to excuse* the sin of *Eve* and defend the honour of the Sex. Take *Tertullians* Verses as a Comment on *Irenæus*, who speaks fully and clearly what he meant,

Lib. 1. adverſ. *Marcionem. V. Origen* in Dialog, p. 256. & *Tertul. de Habitu mulier.* c. 10.

Virgo viro nocuit, ſed vir de virgine vicit;
Virginis at virgo, caro carnis debita ſolvat.

That as by a Virgin came Death, so also by a Virgin came deliverance from Death. The Virgin *Mary* in and by her Son making full reparation or satisfaction for *Eves* transgression. What? Doth this concern religious Invocation of the blessed Virgin? But I shall not satisfie my self, much less others, in bare Asserting. Let us come to the trial of the Cause and produce our Witnesses.

Ecclesia nec invocationibus Angelicis facit aliquid, sed purè orationes dirigens ad Dominum. Iren. lib. 20. c. 57. *in fine.*

Justin Martyr, Apol. 2. giving an account to the Emperor *Antoninus* of the Christian Religion saith, We offer up the Sacrifices of Prayer and Thanksgiving to God; We think him *alone* worthy of this Honour, by whom all things were created. And a little after, We worship God *alone*.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 15. *V. Lactant.* Instit. lib. 5. cap. 11. *de vera relig.* c. 55. *Cont. Faustum*, lib. 22. c. 21.

The Church of *Smyrna* being accused by the Heathens, as if they intended to worship their martyred Bishop Saint *Polycarp*, answer in vindication of themselves, We worship Christ the Son of God, but Martyrs we worthily love ἀγαπῶμεν as his Disciples and faithful Servants, whose memory on their *Natalitia* or *Obit* days we celebrate: which exactly agrees with St. *Austins*'s dogmatical resolution of this Question. We honour Angels *Charitate, non servitute, with love*, not *service*: and in another place, with the worship or honour of Love and Fellowship, *as holy Men* are *worshipped* in *this life*.

Origen

Origen against *Celsus*. The good Angels in some sense we reverence, honour or worship as Gods Ministers, but we worship one God and his onely Son with Prayers and supplications, offering them to God by his onely begotten, begging that he as our High Priest would present them to God. He saith not by the Intercession of Saints upon our Prayers to them, or Angels, but Christ the Son of God our High Priest, whose peculiar Office it is as such to present our Prayers and spiritual Sacrifices unto God. And a little after, God *alone* is to be prayed unto. Prayers are to be offered also to his onely Son. And whereas *Celsus* alledged (as now Papists do) the power of Courtiers to injure or help those who respect or disrespect them, *Origen* adviseth him to commit and commend himself to *God onely* the Supreme Ruler of all things, and to beg of him all that help and protection which cometh from Angels and just Men; For, saith he, as the shadow follows the motion of the Body, so he that pleaseth God hath the Friends of God, Angels and blessed Souls favourable to him, who will render God more favourable, and will pray together with him, *although unrequested*. But of our praying therefore to them not a word is to be found in all his Books against *Celsus*, yea in these words the ground of all Invocation of Saints or Angels is wholly taken away. Not to weary the Reader, *lib.* 5. in *Cels.* p. 233. He saith, all Prayers are to be offered up to God, and that it is not fit or reasonable εὔλογον Ἀγγέλους καλέσαι, to call upon Angels. If not on Angels, much less on Saints. The same we find, *lib.* 8. in *Cels.* p. 402.

Lib. 8, p. 386. Edit. Cant. and the same he saith, *lib.* 5. *c.* 60. vet. Edit.

μόνῳ.

V. Ambros. p. 300. in Rom. cap. 1.

V. Origen. in Romanos 2. p. 140.

Clemens Alexandrinus accounted it gross folly to beg of those who are no Gods as if they were; wherefore justly (seeing there is one good God) we and Angels beg of him the bestowing of good things.

Strom. 7.

Tertullian says, These things I can beg of none else but of him of whom I know I shall obtain them, because he alone (which Papists dare not deny) granteth them, and I to whom it belongeth to obtain them am his Servant, whom (not Saints or Angels) I onely serve or observe. And in another place, We are to ask of him by whom something is promised, *i. e.* God. Have Saints or Angels promised us any thing? *De præscript.* c. 8.

Apologet. cap. 34. *Præcepit Christus secretè orare ut quem ubique audire fideret, ei soli Religionem offerret. Tertullian. Apologet.* cap. 30.

Arnobius

Arnobius, Lib. 3. *contra Gent.* The first God is enough to us, in him we worship all that is to be worshipped.

Lactantius agreeth with him: for he adviseth all men to look up and adore nothing, worship nothing but the Majesty of God our Father and Maker.

Invocatio supponit omnipræsentiam lib. 6. p. 183. Instit. lib. 2. cap. 16. 17.

Eusebius Cæsar. Demonstr. lib. 1. c. 5. & lib. 3. c. 3. sheweth, that the *Jewish* Church directed their Adorations to God onely; and for Christians he affirmeth, *lib.* 4. *c.* 6. that they prayed to God onely in the name of Christ (not of Saints or Angels) as their Mediator. For seeing, saith he, it is peculiar to Christ, as the great High Priest, to frame for us spiritual Sacrifices in praises and thanksgivings, and because as a Priest he hath offered up himself a perfect Sacrifice to God for us; hence we say to him, let him remember all thy sacrifice, *&c.* Here we see Propitiation is the ground of Intercession. As for Angels, he granteth to them τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ μέτριον τῆς ἀξίας, honour according to the dignity of their excellent nature. (so do we) but reserveth σεβάσμιον τιμὴν all religious honour or worship to God only. This is the very Doctrine of Protestants. The due honour of Saints he explaineth thus: We go to their Sepulchres θήκας αὐτῶν, at them, πρὸς τούτοις τὰς εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι to make Prayers, not αὐτοῖς ipsis to them (as *Trapezuntius* falsly, if not perfidiously translated it) but πρὸς τούτοις, at them, which is another thing.

V. Origen. supra. Psalm 20. *Si cultus tantum dicatur, non soli Deo debetur, sed religio, &c. Aug. de Civit. Dei*, l. 10. c. 1. *De Præp.* lib. 12. c. 7.

But let us hear the testimony of *Athanasius* the truly Great, who every where in his Orations against the *Arians*, proveth (as the rest of the Fathers unanimously do) Christ to be true God by this argument, especially because he is prayed to; which were of no force if any Creature, Saint or Angel might be in any sense invocated. Particularly in his fourth Oration against the *Arians* from that Prayer of Saint *Paul*, God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you: He inferreth Christ to be consubstantial with the Father. For no man is a true Catholick, (which appeareth

Orat. tertia in Arian.

V. Novatian de Trinit. c. 14. *Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur in orationibus invocatur, &c. Quomodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit, sed Dei?*

hereby

hereby a Papist is not) would pray to receive any thing of God and Angels or any Creature. Neither, saith he, hath any Christian as yet (then Invocation of Saints or Angels was unknown and unpractised amongst all true Christians) used this form of Prayer or words: *God, and an Angel* (we may add *Saint*) *grant it you.* Whether Papists use not such forms of words in their Prayers is too notorious to be proved to any who are acquainted with their Books of Devotion. Then taking notice of one of their chief Arguments now pressed by our new *Roman* Catholicks for proof of their Invocation of Angels, to wit, the words of dying *Jacob*, *The Angel that delivered me out of all my distresses, bless the Lads: Athanasius* (as the other Fathers unanimously) expounds them not of any created Angel, but of the Son of God, who is God and the Angel of the Covenant, whom *Jacob* saw face to face at *Peniel*, and termeth God. He addeth, *David* prayed to none for deliverance but to God; *To thee, O Lord, have I cryed*, &c. and concludes, δῆλον ἐστι. It is evident the Patriarch *Jacob* joined none in his prayer to God but the Word, whom he therefore calleth *the Angel*, because he alone revealeth the Father. Do not they then willingly abuse themselves and others, who take *Athanasius* for a *Roman* Catholick, or Invocation of Angels for an Article of the antient Catholick faith, held by all sound Christians in all Ages, or that the Angel appearing to the Old Patriarchs, was a created Angel?

Laus Dec, Virginique Mariæ, in fine. Tom 2. & 3. *Bellarm.* See Dr. *Brevint's Saul* and *Samuel* at *Endor.*

So *Euseb.* Hist. lib. 1. cap. 2. *Ambrose* in Psalm. 43. *Novatian. de Trinit.*

Κτίσματι κτίσμα οὐ προσκυνεῖ· Θεοῦ ἐστι μόνου προσκυνεῖσθαι. *Aug. Hi agnoscunt se esse creaturas.*

Ἐκ τῶν προσκυνοῦντων μὴ προσκυνομένων. *Athanas.* Orat. 3. in *Arian.*

I will add his Contemporary Saint *Hilary*, who altho he granteth (which Protestants deny not) that the Angels pray for the Church Militant here on Earth, yet he no where alloweth Invocation of them, but on *Psalm* 29, and 124. he adviseth all Christians to pray to God, in regard he is Omnipresent in all places, ready to help, which is not true of Saints or Angels. In like manner on *Psalm* 140. he saith, *Magnificentiæ Dei est orari, It pertaineth to the magnificence or Prerogative of God to be prayed unto.*

In maledicto est religio creaturæ. Hil. de Trinit. l. 8. p. 106.

Hitherto the Coaſt is clear, and we have the unanimous conſent of the Fathers for about 340 years after Chriſt againſt Invocation of Saints, Angels or any Creature. Whence we undoubtedly conclude that it is, tho a part of the preſent *Roman*, yet not of the true antient and Catholick Faith believed *ſemper, ubique, & apud omnes*, always, in all places, by all ſound Chriſtians, for ſuch Doctrines, as *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* rightly notes, are onely truly Catholick, that is, Univerſal, as the name it ſelf *Catholick* ſignifies.

To proceed. *Baſil* the Great, *Hom.* 3. *in Hexaemeron.* all Honour, Worſhip προσκύνησις, is due to God onely. In *Pſalm* 7. he ſaith, Our hope is to be placed in God onely. In *Pſal.* 18. That if any man worſhip the Creature beſide (tho with) the Creator, he giveth not glory to God, but the Creature; and in *Pſalm* 45. Inſtead of Saints and Angels he telleth us, that in all our neceſſities God is our onely Refuge. In his Funeral Oration on *Gordius*, he acquainteth us with the true ends of thoſe commendatory or commemoratory Solemnities obſerved on the *Natalitia* or Feſtivals of the Martyrs, to wit, to glorifie God, and to ſtir up the people to imitation of their Virtues, but no mention find we there of praying to them.

I am not ignorant that out of *Baſil, Nazianzen, Gregory Nyſſen*, &c. their Funeral Orations, ſome Rhetorical Apoſtrophes to and Compellations of the Saints deceaſed are urged for Invocation of Saints by *Bellarmine* and others.

To which I anſwer, Firſt, That in the moſt Primitive and antient Fathers, we as we have ſeen, find them not; from the beginning it was not ſo. Secondly, That Rhetorical flouriſhes of Eloquence are no ſafe and ſure grounds to build an Article of faith upon, as *Theodoret* grants, *Non ego dogmatum regulam ea duco, quæ in Eccleſia Panegyricè dicantur.* The Fathers in their Panegyrical Orations and popular Sermons (as *Sixtus Senenſis* a Papiſt acknowledgeth) ſpake often *affectuum impetu & orationis curſu rapti*, ſuch things as taken according to the literal and ſtrict ſenſe cannot be juſtified.

Dial. 3.

Biblioth. lib. 6. *Annotat.* 152.

To give one inſtance amongſt many. *Nazianzen* in his Funeral Oration on St. *Baſil* ſaith of him. Now in Heaven ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, as I ſuppoſe (for he was not certain) προσφέρει θυσίας he offereth up Sacrifices for us. Yet no Papiſt will ſay that he

he celebrated Mass, or as we speak, the Holy Eucharist, or consecrated it in Heaven, as that phrase of Offering Sacrifice is sometimes used by the Fathers. In like manner he saith of his Father, that he did in Heaven προσπολεμεῖν fight for his Flock on Earth. Thirdly, Many of their expressions are not προσεύχαι Prayers, but rather εὔχαι, wishes. So *Nazianzen* in his Oration on *Basil*; Thou, O sacred and divine Head, *respice nos quæso de cœlo*, look on us from Heaven; So *Billius* a Papist, falsly translates it. In the *Greek* the word is, ἐποπτεύοις, *O si*, or *utinam nos de cœlo respiceres*; O that, or I wish, thou mightest look down from Heaven on us. So that it is rather a Wish than a true Prayer. This is certain, *Nazianzen* in the Oration above-mentioned no where prayeth to his *own Father*.

Πείθομαι δὲ εἰ μὴ τολμερὸν τοῦτο εἰπεῖν.

Mountague of Invocation of the Saints,

4. They speak doubtfully and uncertainly; so *Nazianzen* making an Apostrophe to the Soul of *Constantius*, puts in εἴ τις αἴσθησις, if thou hast any sense or knowledge of our affairs; I am compelled to speak to him as present. More plainly in his Oration on his Sister *Gorgonia*, εἰ τοῦτο τὸ γέρας τῶν τοιούτων ἐπαιδαγεσθαι, If there be such a reward bestowed on pious Souls, εἴ τις σοὶ καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων λόγος, that thou hast any knowledge or regard of our affairs, receive τὸν λόγον, not *orationem*, my prayer (for he no where prays to her, or Saint *Basil*, or his Father) but my speech, *sermonem*, which certainly he would have done had he been a right *Roman* Catholick. But who can imagine or believe that *Nazianzen*, *Basil* and other of the antient Fathers would have spoken concerning the Saints departed, their knowledge of humane affairs, so doubtfully and uncertainly, if they had in the least believed that Invocation of Saints in Heaven was an Article of Catholick Faith necessary to be believed under peril of Heresie and Damnation. *Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.*

But before I go on, I will take particular notice of a place quoted by *Bellarmine* out of Saint *Basil*'s Oration on the 40 Martyrs in these words: *Qui aliquâ premitur angustiâ ad hos confugiat*, &c. He that is in any affliction or strait, let him fly to these, *i. e.* these Martyrs. To this I answer, First, That *Bellarmine* abuseth his Reader with a false *Latin* Translation, which is not unusual with him. In the *Greek* it is

onely καταφύγη, not let him, but he doth fly to them. Here is matter of fact or practice; they did ſo: But here is no approbation, advice or counſel of Saint *Baſil* that they ſhould do ſo. Secondly, He exhorts them to join their Prayers unto, and with the ſupplications of the Martyrs. Here then we find Interceſſion by them, not Prayer to them. Thirdly, It is to be conſidered that theſe 40 Martyrs were all *Cappadocians* of that Country, and ſo being, as I ſuppoſe, not long ſince deceaſed, might retain ſome particular remembrance of the place of their Nativity, and near Relations. There is not the ſame reaſon of praying to Saints, who never knew us nor we them. Fourthly, In that very place Saint *Baſil* affirmeth, that theſe 40 Martyrs, not ſeverally, but all together were at the ſame time with divers perſons in diſtant places, which whether it be a truth or no, I appeal to the judgment of any learned Papiſt. They in ſome things reject the ſayings of the Fathers, as well as we. Laſtly, He ſpeaketh only of the place and time of their annual Feſtivity, which will not amount to a ſufficient ground of Invocation in any place, and at any time of need of any Saint.

Montague of Invocation of Saints.

I now paſs on to St. *Chryſoſtome*, who *Hom.* 44. in *Gen. Hom.* 5. in *Matth. Hom. de Profectu Evang.* and elſewhere exhorteth his Hearers not to rely on the Interceſſion of others, but to go immediately to God themſelves, propounding to them the Example of the Woman of *Canaan*, who was never the better for the Apoſtles Interceſſion, who intreated not *Peter* or *James* to beg for her, but went directly to Chriſt herſelf, and received a better anſwer from him. Then he addeth, There is no need of Interceſſors with God.

Hom. 12. in Matth.

V. Ambroſe infra.

I come to *Theodoret*, who in his Comment *Coloſſ.* 2. hath theſe words, which give a deadly blow to this new point of Faith, to wit, worſhipping Angels mentioned and condemned by Saint *Paul* in that Chapter, *v.* 18. They, ſaith he, who defended the Law perſuaded the *Coloſſians* to worſhip Angels, ſaying, that the Law was given by them. Obſerve, their reaſon is not becauſe they were Gods or Creators of the World, but deliverers of the Law, as Saint *Stephen* noteth, *Acts* 7. This Errour, ſaith he, remained a long time in *Phrygia* and *Piſidia*; wherefore the Synod of *Laodicea*, not far diſtant from *Coloſſe*, forbid by a Law or Canon *praying*

to

to *Angels*, and to this day (adds he) are to be ſeen the Oratories (not of any Heatheniſh Idol) but of Saint *Michael* the Arch-Angel. This they adviſed, pretending or under a ſhew of voluntary humility; for they ſaid, God himſelf could not be ſeen or comprehended, neither could be approached unto, and we muſt gain his favour through the Angels. Thus *Theodoret*. Here we have the Original of the worſhipping of Angels, to wit, certain Hereticks condemn'd by Saint *Paul*, by the Council of *Laodicea* and *Theodoret*. We may note alſo, that the Argument uſed by the *Romaniſts* to eſtabliſh this pretended Article of Faith is borrowed from Hereticks, to wit, that God being infinite and incomprehenſible, it becometh not the humility of ſinful Creatures to make immediate addreſſes to him, but to uſe the Interceſſion of Angels the favourites of God. Cardinal *Baronius* is ſo netled with this teſtimony of *Theodoret*, that notwithſtanding his pretended reverence of the Fathers, he ſaith plainly, *Theodoreti pace dictum ſit, non aſſequitur mentem Pauli*, *Let it be ſpoken by the good leave of* Theodoret, *that he underſtandeth not St.* Paul's *meaning*. But by *Baronius* his leave, I think *Theodoret*, though no Cardinal, underſtood St. *Paul*'s meaning as well, yea far better than he. The Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* related to by *Theodoret*, we find expreſſed in theſe words: *It becometh not Chriſtians leaving the Church to run to Angels* (their Oratories) *and to hold meetings of abominable Idolatry*. Where you ſee running to, *i. e.* as *Theodoret* underſtood it, praying to and ſo worſhiping Angels at their Oratories, is condemned by the Council as no leſs Crime (tho Papiſts cannot endure to hear it) than abominable Idolatry. *Caranza* a Popiſh Tranſlator of the old Trade, ignorantly or wickedly turns ἀγγέλους *Angelos* Angels, into *angulos*, *Corners* But according to the old ſaying, *Veritas non quærit angulos*, Truth ſeeketh not theſe Corners.

Ad Ann. *Chriſti* 60. ſect. 17, 22.

Can. 35.

I had almoſt forgot the good old Father *Epiphanius*, in all whoſe Writings *Bellarmine* it ſeemeth could find nothing for Invocation of Saints; but we can produce what is directly againſt it. *Hæreſ.* 74. *contra Collyrid.* he condemneth certain fond Women of more zeal than knowledge, who like thoſe in *Jeremy*, offer'd up Cakes to the Virgin *Mary* as the Queen of Heaven (a Title the *Roman* Catholicks have, little to her

Jer. 7. 18.

her honour, put upon her) saying, If God will not have Angels worshipped, how much less the Daughter of *Ann*, born as other Women (*ergo* in Original Sin.) What then do we, as *Romanists* calumniate us, or *Epiphanius*, deny *Mary* her due honour? No. We say with *Epiphanius*, *Let her be in honour, but let God alone be adored*; Let none worship *Mary*, she is to be honoured, (as we really grant) but she is not given us πρὸς προσκύνησιν to be bowed to, or worshipped. So that no religious worship is to be given to her. Certainly these foolish Women were not so silly as to take the Holy Virgin for a Goddess or Deity, (but adored her as the Mother of Christ) for then they had been plain Heathens rather than, as *Epiphanius* esteemed them, Hereticks. Surely, if offering up to the Virgin *Mary* a few Cakes was heretical and unlawful, is it not much worse to offer up to her the Evangelical Sacrifices of (to say nothing now of their Masses in honour of her) Prayers, Vows and Thanksgivings, which themselves acknowledge to be acts of *Latria* or *Divine Worship*, of which their Offices of the Virgin *Mary* and Books of Devotion are brimful. In them they beg of her Grace and Glory; Affirm (which is sacrilegious blasphemy) that God hath made over the Kingdom of his mercy to her. They term her the *Mother of mercy*, and *fountain of Grace*; the *Queen of Heaven*, their *Life* and *onely hope*. In a word, they stile her, as Cardinal *Bembus*, Deam, *a Goddess*. Is not this far to exceed the *Collyridian* Hereticks? Is not this adoring of her gross Idolatry?

Aquin. 2. 2. quæst. 88. art. 5.
V. Chemnit. Exam. *p.* 609, 610. & 580, 581.
Biel in Can. Missæ, lect. 8.
Chemnit. supra, p. 585. 595.

See B. *Andrews*'s Answer to Cardinal *Perron*. *O fœlix Puerpera, nostra pians scelera, Jure matris impera Redemptori.*

I come now to the learned *Cyril* Patriarch of *Alexandria* in his sixth Book against *Julian* the Apostate, who objected, that the Christians instead of many Gods worshiped many miserable Men, to wit, Christ and the Martyrs; To which he answereth, We worship Christ a man, but God as well as man. Where we may observe that the grounds of worshipping the man Christ Jesus is, because he was God as well as man, not a religious man or Saint only: As for the Martyrs, we, saith *Cyril* worship them, not λατρευτικῶς, with *latria* or divine Worship, but

but χρηστῶς καὶ τιμητικῶς, relatively and honourably, (that is, with honourable reſpect) ſuch, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, as we yield to Holy men in this life in reſpect of their piety and godlineſs. Then he ſheweth, wherein the honour given to Martyrs did conſiſt, to wit, in a reverend regard to their θήκας, Tombs or Monuments, in crowning them with Praiſes as Conquerors—and concludes, we beſtow on them τὴν ἀμάραντον μνήμην, an immortal or never withering memory. But no mention at all of any Religious (tho the grounds of honouring Martyrs is their Piety and Religion) Worſhip, Invocation or Adoration.

The ſame *Cyril* on the 16. Chapter of St. *John* hath theſe words, *No man cometh to the Father but by the Son.* Hence he termeth himſelf *the Door and Way*, who, as he is the Son and God, beſtoweth with the Father all good things on us. As our Mediator and High Prieſt preſenteth our Prayers to God; and hence concludeth, We muſt therefore pray in the name of our Saviour, if we would be heard of God.

Saint *Ambroſe de obitu Theodoſii* ſpeaketh to the ſame purpoſe, *Thou, O Lord, art alone to be invocated, ſolus rogandus es*, art onely to be prayed unto. On the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, c. 1. he hath theſe remarkable words, ſpoken I confeſs of Heathens, but too juſtly applicable to Papiſts, who uſe the very ſame excuſes: Being, ſaith he, aſhamed of their neglect of God the Creator (by worſhipping Creatures rather than him) they uſe a miſerable ſhift ſaying, by them, *i. e.* Angels and dead Heroes, men may go to God, as by Counts, or Earls, or Courtiers we uſe to go to the King. It is our Adverſaries ordinary Similitude. What ſaith St. *Ambroſe* to it? Is any man ſo mad and unmindful of his own ſafety (it being *læſa Majeſtas*, Treaſon) as to give the honour of the King to a Count, and not judge themſelves guilty who yield the honour of God to a Creature, and adore, leaving the Lord, their Fellow-ſervants, as if there were any thing more to be given to God. For therefore we go to the King by Lords and Captains becauſe he is a man, but to God, to whom nothing is hid and who knoweth all mens deſerts, there is no need of an Interceſſour, but a devout mind. This is plain.

Rom. 1. 25.

Tertul. de Præſcr. c. 8. ſaith the ſame. Rev. 22. 9. See *Chryſoſt. de Pœnit.* Hom. 4. & *de profectu Evangel.*

I go

I go on to Saint *Hierom*, who in his Epitaph on *Nepotian* acknowledgeth, that although the Saints departed possibly pray for us, yet do not hear our prayers or Apostrophes to them: "Whatsoever I shall say is as if I said nothing, for he (*Nepotian*) heareth me not. It's also not unworthy of our observation, as *Chemnitius* hath noted, that Saint *Hierom* in his Book against *Vigilantius*, who condemn'd Invocation of Saints, censures him not as an Heretick for so doing. If it had been then a point of Faith, no doubt St. *Hierom* would not have spared him. Yea, in his Epistle to *Riparius* he saith of Angels and dead Saints or Martyrs, *nec colimus nec adoramus, We neither adore them* (with λατεία) *nor worship them* (with δουλεία, an inferiour religious worship) although (as we Protestants do) *honoramus*, we honour them.

Ille non audit. Examen Concilii Trident.

I will end with Saint *Austin*, in his 22. Book *de Civitate Dei*, Cap. 10. he saith, The Saints are at the Communion named by the Priest, but not invocated. In the Canon of the Mass; *Commemorantes & memoriam facientes*, Prayer is directed to God onely. In his 8th Book, *de Civit. Dei*, cap. 17. 22, 27. he affirmeth expressly, That whatsoever religious Services were performed at the Tombs of the Martyrs: as Prayers, Sacrifices, Thanksgivings, were offered not to them, but to God. So *contra Faust.* lib. 20. c. 21. *Quicquid offertur, Deo offertur*. In his Epistle to *Maximus* the Grammarian, Know, saith Saint *Austin*, that of Catholicks, (true Catholicks, not *Roman*) no dead man is worshipped; And in his Book of *True Religion*, c. 55. Our Religion stands not in worshipping the dead. They seek not such honour. This they would have, that we with them worship one God according to the Angels admonition, *Revel.* 22. 9. Martyrs are to be honoured (as *Origen*, *Cyril*, *Epiphanius* granted) for imitation, not adored for Religion: or as he expresseth it, *Cont. Faustum*, l. 20. c. 21. *colimus Martyres*, &c. we worship or honour Martyrs with a worship *of love and fellowship*, with which the Saints in this life are worshipped. Is any religious Worship properly so called, to be given to Saints or religious Persons by us in this life? Let our Adversaries consider this. Lastly, in his Book *De Cura pro mortuis*, cap. 10. 11, 12. He overthroweth the principal grounds and reasons on which Invocation of Saints is built. For first,

Nominantur, non invocantur.

Nos Martyribus non Templa, sicut Diis, sed Memorias (sicut hominibus mortuis) fabricamus, &c. Aug. de Civit. Dei, lib. 22. c. 10. *similiter*, lib. 8. cap. *ultimo.*

Charitate non servitute. Ibid.

firſt, He judgeth it very probable at leaſt, that the Saints or Martyrs did not really and perſonally appear to their Friends, although it was believed by many, but in imagination or appearance onely. Secondly, He proveth (which he ſaith he knew would be ill taken hy ſome) that the ſouls of the departed Saints are in a place where they ſee or know not what is done by or happens to their neareſt Relations, from Gods Promiſe to *Joſiah*, 2 *Chron.* 34 18. That he ſhould not ſee all the Evil he would bring on his People; as alſo from thoſe words of *Eſaiah*, *Abraham is ignorant of us and Iſrael knows us not.* Whence he infers, *ſi tanti Patriarchæ*, &c. If ſuch great Patriarchs were ignorant of what happened to the People who ſprang from them, how are the dead intereſſed or concerned in knowing and helping their Friends? He confirmeth his concluſion thus: If the dead were intereſted in the affairs of the living, or ſpake to us in Dreams, my dear Mother would no night he abſent from me. But it's true, as in the *Pſalm*, *My Father and my Mother have forſaken me*, &c. If our Parents have forſaken us, who elſe among the dead know what we do or ſuffer? Now our Adverſaries grant, that unleſs the Saints departed know our particular ſtate and wants, it is vain and to no purpoſe to pray unto them. Thirdly, He anſwers an Objection drawn from *Dives* his deſiring *Abraham* to ſend to his Brethren on Earth, wherefore he knew what they did. To this he replieth, *Dives* had ſuch or ſo great a care of the living, although he knew not what they did, as we have of the dead, although what they do we know not in particular. It was onely a general care or well-wiſhing: But, *Abraham* knew they had *Moſes* and the Prophets. To this he anſwereth, that he might know it by the information of *Lazarus*. Fourthly, He enquireth how the Saints come *poſtea* afterwards (ſo that this knowledge cometh too late to ground Prayer to Saints in preſent extremities and ſudden dangers.) He anſwereth, *Poſſunt ab Angelis, poſſint Deo revelante cognoſcere*, they may know it by Angels who are converſant with us, or by Revelation from God; they may, he ſaith not poſitively that they do. Fifthly, He maketh a difference (which *Romaniſts* take little notice of) between Martyrs and other Saints, and denies that becauſe Martyrs

Compare *Baſil. M. in Mamantem.*

Iſai. 63. 16.

per Divinam potentiam miraculouſly, or by ſpecial diſpenſation are ſometimes here on Earth in their Temples, therefore we are to think the ſame of all dead Saints generally, or that they can come to us *quando volunt*, when they will, as *Bellarmine* determines. But miraculous Diſpenſations are no ſafe Rule for ordinary ſupplications to all Saints promiſcuouſly. Laſtly, ſuppoſing it true that the living are helped ſome way or other by Martyrs prayed unto; he ſaith, Whether it be by their being preſent in ſo many diſtant places at the ſame time where their memories (*i. e.* Monuments or Churches) are, or (which no doubt he could not but think more probable) whether they being in ſome place remote from humane converſe are yet generally praying for ſuch as pray (not to them, but God who might employ Angels in anſwering their requeſts) as we pray in the general for the dead, although we know not where they are, or what they do, *definire non audeo*, I dare not reſolve. From all which we may eaſily diſcern how uncertain Saint *Auſtin* was concerning the preſence, knowledge and aſſiſtance of Saints departed, afforded to ſome, not who pray to them but to God; from whence we may certainly conclude, that Invocation of dead Saints was no part of St. *Auſtin*'s Creed, but at utmoſt a probable and doubtful Opinion onely, as we have ſeen before from the writings of the *Greek* Fathers, *Nazianzen*, *Baſil* and others.

D. Sanct. Beatit. lib. 1. c. 20.

I know well, our Adverſaries urge much *Nazianzen*'s *Oration* on *Cyprian*, and how a Virgin aſſaulted by the Devil, prayed to the Virgin *Mary* to help her.

But *Gelaſius* with the Authority of the *Roman* Church condemns that Book of the Converſion of Saint *Cyprian*, which *Nazianzen* ſuppoſed to be genuine, as falſe and ſuppoſititious; neither is it at all probable that Saint *Cyprian* was ever a Magician, of which neither himſelf in the relation of his converſion, nor *Pontius* in his life, nor any more antient creditable Writer maketh any mention.

Lib 2. Epiſt. 2.

They glory alſo much in thoſe words of Saint *Chryſoſtome*, He that is Emperour ſtandeth praying to the Saints, to the Tent-maker, and Fiſherman *Peter*, and *Paul* to intercede with God for him.

Hom. 66. *ad Popul. Antioch.*

To

To which I firſt oppoſe Saint *Auſtin*'s words; The Emperour at the Tomb of *Peter*, prayeth not to *Peter*, but God. Secondly, The Homily is ſuppoſititious; for, as *Bellarmine* himſelf granteth, the true Homilies of *Chryſoſtome*, *ad Popul. Antiochen.* were but 21. Thirdly, *Chryſoſtome* held, that Chriſtian Saints departed are not till the Reſurrection admitted to the ſight of God, and conſequently, knowledge of our Prayers. Of which Opinion were many of the antient Fathers, quoted for this Invocation by our Adverſaries.

Epiſt. 42. *non Petro, ſed Deo.* *De ſcript. Eccl. ad ann.* 398. Hom 39. in 1 Cor. 15. *Sixtus Senenſ.*

I come to another Article of Pope *Pius* his *Roman* Catholick Faith, to wit, worſhipping of Images. Concerning which it is certain, that the Chriſtian Churches for three hundred years after Chriſt had in them no Images to worſhip. To which purpoſe it is remarkable what *Ælius Lampridius* * an Heathen Hiſtorian writes; When *Adrian* the Emperour had commanded that Temples ſhould be made in all Cities without Images: it was preſently conceived that he did prepare thoſe Temples for Chriſt. Secondly, That worſhipping them came in above ſix hundred years after Chriſt: for Pope *Gregory* the Great himſelf allowed not of worſhipping Images, as is manifeſt from his Epiſtle to *Serenus*, who broke down Images in ſome Churches becauſe the People worſhipped them. Thirdly, That a great part of the Writings of the Antient Fathers *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, &c. are ſpent in condemning the worſhip of Images, or uſing them as helps of Devotion.

Art. 5. Concerning Image-worſhip.

The Temple at *Jeruſalem* had none. *Philo de Leg. ad Caium.*

* In the Life of *Alexander Severus.*

Lib. 7. Epiſt. 109. *Quia eas adorari vetuiſſes omnino laudavimus*, &c. Lib. 9. Epiſt. 9.

He commends him for forbidding the worſhipping them, though not his breaking them.

It's true, They ſpeak directly againſt the Images and Idols of the Heathens, but moſt of their Reaſons fight generally againſt all religious uſe or worſhip of Images of what kind ſoever, eſpecially of Images made to repreſent God himſelf. Let us then hear the Fathers and judge.

Juſtin Martyr ſaith, It's ὕβρις, an injury or contumely to God to make an Image of him ἐξ ἀτίμων, of baſe and unworthy wood or ſtone. That we ought not to worſhip the work of mens hands. Are not Popiſh Images of the Trinity the work of mens hands, made of wood and ſtone as well as thoſe of the Heathens?

Apol. 2. p. 44; pag. 52.

Origen in Cap. 1. *ad Rom.* and *lib.* 3. *in Celsum*, saith the same, of whom more by and by.

Athenagoras in Legat. to the Heathens, asking, Why the Christians worshipped not Statues, Answers, because material Statues and God very much differ. Not the World (or any part of it) but it's Maker is to be worshipped. Men (saith he to the Emperour) pass by or through your Palace and above all honour you. In your Games they crown not the Harp, but the Harpers. We submit not an immaterial Spirit (*i. e.* the Soul) to worship material and beggerly Elements, *i. e.* Images. Doth not this confute submitting our Souls in religious worship to Popish Images? are not they material? *&c.*

Lib. 1. c. 24. *Epiphan. Panar. Hær.* 27. *& in Anaceph.* p. 525. c. 20.

Irenæus testifieth, that the *Gnostick* or *Carpocratian* Hereticks (the first worshippers of Images we can find amongst Christians) crowned the Image of Christ made by *Pilate*, as they said, and worshipped it. The *Simonians*, followers of *Simon Magus*, worshipped his Image, and of *Helena* his Whore. *Ib.* Ch. 26. The *Basilidian* Hereticks used also Images, *Ib.* Ch. 23. Here we see the Primitive Antiquity and first Original of worshipping Images: the Authors were then condemned Hereticks, but now their Abettors are the only true Catholicks.

Apologet. c. 12.

Tertullian saith, We Christians worship (he speaks generally) no Statues or Images, which Crows, Rats and Spiders understand. Do they not as well understand Popish Images? They seem to understand them better than *Romanists*. Yea, the Antient Fathers so detested Images, that they condemned the very Art of Painting and Graving, excommunicating such Christians who onely to get a livelihood made them, as he sheweth, *De Idololat.* c. 4, 5, 6.

V. p. 46. and *Strom.* 5.

In like manner *Clemens Alexand. in Protreptico*, where he farther saith, I have learned *to tread upon Earth* (*i. e.* Images or Statues) *not to worship them.*

πατεῖν οὐ προσκυνεῖν· *Protr.* p. 38. *Simiæ Imaginibus non decipiuntur, vos deteriores. Protrept. ad gentes*, p. 39.

It would be too tedious to quote all that *Origen* hath written against worshipping Images in his Books only against *Celsus*: I will mention some few passages, *Lib.* 3. He saith, we instil first of all into all young Christians a contempt of all Images, and lift up their minds (Images then lift not up the mind to God) from Veneration of Creatures to God.

In

In the Jewiſh Commonwealth no maker of Images was ſuffer'd, which turn the mind from God. Our New Catholicks ſay, they turn the mind to God. In his ſixth Book he writeth thus: We count them rude and ignorant who are not aſhamed to ſpeak to ſenſleſs things, to beg life of the dead, although ſome of them confeſs they are not Gods (as Papiſts excuſe themſelves) but ſigns and repreſentations of them onely. However, they are ignorant in imagining that a vain Smith or Carpenter can make (ſo much as) a reſemblance of Divinity. In the ſame Book he adds, They are blind who regard the fallacious Arts of Painters or Carvers. In his 8th Book, *Celſus* the Heathen accuſeth the Chriſtians for not having, yea not enduring to look on Images; Which; ſaith he, none but fools take to be Gods themſelves, (the Heathens were not ſo fooliſh) but *ſigna*, ſigns or Repreſentations of them: yea not Gods, but *Dæmons*, Angels, To which *Origen* replieth both for *Jews* and Chriſtians; In regard of thoſe words, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God and him onely ſhalt thou ſerve. And thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image*, &c. It cannot be that any one who *knoweth God* ſhould pray alſo to Images. Do theſe reaſons confute onely Heathen Image-worſhippers? Did not the Primitive Fathers and Chriſtians underſtand thoſe Texts as Proteſtants now do? He adds, We have alſo Images (of what kind?) not made by impure Workmen, but by the Word of God, Temperance, Juſtice and other Virtues. So that *Origen* in the name of the Chriſtians in his days rejects and condemns all material Images in order to religious worſhip.

Lib. 4. *Cont. Celſum.* Pag. 284.

See *Caſſander* Conſult. Art. 21.

See *Minutius Fœlix*, *Arnobius*, &c.

Arnobius brings in the Heathens ſaying, *non ipſa timemus ſimulachra*, &c. we fear not the Images, but thoſe whom they repreſent, *i. e.* Gods (who were but dead men) *Dæmons*, Angels and Heroes. Yet he grants, that by them they ſtrook the vulgar (as Papiſts do) with fear and dread of God. And Lib. 7th, he acquaints us that the Original of Images was, that men could not conceive what God is, and therefore reſolved to make him like themſelves.

lib. 6.

Lactantius

Lactantius, Instit. Lib. 1. saith, We cannot worship God, if we give the same honour to any thing else. But the Papists, as *Aquinas*, *Cajetan*, *Catechismus Rom.* *Azorius*, *Pedro de Crabrera*, &c. acknowledge and defend, they give to the Images of God and Christ *latria*, i. e. the very same Divine Honour they yield to God and Christ themselves. In vain then do they *worship God, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men:* yea so besotted are they with their Images, that they condemn *Durand* as little less than a Heretick, for saying that Images are adored onely improperly, because they put men in mind of the Persons represented by them, so that they properly adore not the Images, but adore and worship the *Prototypes* before them. Contrarily *Azorius* affirms, as also *Jacob Naclantus* following *Aquinas*, that it's the constant Opinion of their Divines, that the Image is to be worshipped with the same worship given to him, whose Image it is; seeing then for Example Christ is to be adored with *Latria*, so must his Image also. The Faithful, saith *Naclantus*, must not onely *Adore coram Imagine, sed & adorare Imaginem, before the Image, but adore the Image it self.* To return to *Lactantius*. In his 2d Book, he disputes against Images thus: Images are of the absent and dead; But God or the Gods are living and in all places. The Heathens replied, they are present onely in their Images. Then saith *Lactantius*, When they are present, what need of Images. Again, the Heathen Idolaters fear lest all their Religion should be vain, if they see not present before their eyes what they worship, and therefore place Images before them. Do not *Romanists* use Images to the same purpose? He adds, If Images (any Images of whomsoever) had any understanding, they would worship men as more Noble Creatures; and concludes, it is beyond all doubt that there is no Religion (at least true) where there is an Image, but onely a mimical shew of it: This is plain and home.

The Antient Council of *Elliberis*, Ann. 310. decree, that Pictures ought not to be in Churches, lest that which is adored or worshipped should be painted on Walls. *Melchior Canus* (out of his great reverence no doubt of Antiquity) is not afraid to charge this Council not onely with imprudence, but impiety for making such a Canon.

The

Part 3. qu. 25. Art. 3. *Azor.* Instit. *l.* 9. *c.* 6. B. *Usher's* Answer to *Malon.*

Bellarmine de Imag. cap. 21. lib. 2.

In Rom. *c.* 1. *Constans opinio. V. Cassand. Consult. de Imagin.*

In Rom. *c.* 1. *fol.* 42. quoted by Bishop *Usher*, in his Answer to *Malon*, and *Bellar.* l. 2. *de Imag.* c. 20, 21.

Religio nulla ubicunq; simulachrum sed mimus, Ch. 18, 10. So *Varro apud Augustin.* Can. 36.

Non solum imprudenter sed impie, &c. *Loc. Theol.* lib. 5. c. 4.

The Images of Chriſt, and the Woman he healed of her Bloudy-iſſue, as alſo the Pictures of *Peter* and *Paul* in colours, *Euſebius*, *Hiſt.* lib. 7. c. 14. rather excuſeth than commendeth, as implying ſome favour or imitation of Heatheniſh Cuſtome to honour their Benefactors, but hath not a word of any ſort of Worſhip given by any to them, *De Præparat.* lib. 3. c. 3. he ſaith, What corporeal thing can be like God? when we cannot have an image of any mans Soul? He affirmeth, that there was no Image in the Jewiſh Temple, [*V. Philo de legatione*] and Chap. 3. That *Pythagoras* taught by *Moſes*, adviſed the *Romans* not to make any Image of God; whence for one hundred and ſeventy years they had no Images in their Temples.

Ἐθνικὴ συνήθεια. See *Tertul. adv. Marcion.* l. 4. c. 22.

Ibid. *l.* 9. c. 2 *Clem. Strom.* 555. ſaith the ſame, *p.* 304. *Clem. Strom.* 1.

Epiphanius conformably to the Canon of *Elliberis*, finding the Image *Chriſti vel Sancti*, of Chriſt or ſome Saint painted on a Veil in a Church, rent it in pieces as contrary to Divine Law. In another place he telleth us the Virgin *Mary* was to be honored, but not given for us to worſhip; if not her Perſon, much leſs, ſay we her Image. In the ſame place confuting the *Collyridian* Hereſie, he termeth the making Images of God and dead men to be a coarſe, Idolatrous and devilliſh practice, whereby the minds of men go awhoring from the onely true God.

Epiſt. *ad Joannem Hieroſolymit. Contra Collyrid. Hæreſ.* 79.

Τὸ εἰδωλόπλοιον ἐπιτήδευμα καὶ διαβόλικον ἐγχείρημα, &c. *Hæreſ.* 79.

Athanaſius adverſus Gentes, brings in the Heathens pleading for their Images or Idols, that they uſed them as Letters or Lay-mens Books (as Papiſts ſpeak) to help them to ſpell out the nature of God, of which they are marks and ſignificant Characters. To which he anſwereth, that then they ought to Deifie the maker of thoſe Images, and prefer the Artificers before their work made by them; yea, he ſaith, in the beginning that Chriſt the Image of God was made man on purpoſe to draw men off from the uſe of Images. The ſame hath *Euſebius Cæſarienſis*, adding, that true Chriſtians ſpit on the Images of the dead, and worſhip God onely.

Εἰς ὑπέρβασιν μᾶλλον δὲ ἔκκαυσιν τῆς γνώσεως, *Clem. Al. Protrept.* *Divina Majeſtas in ſimulachrorum ſoliditate facilè contemnitur.* Aug. *de Civit. Dei*, l. 4. c. 31.

Chryſoſtome, Hom. 4. *de pœnitentia*, Let us always fly to God both willing and able to relieve us. If we be to make our addreſſes to men, we muſt apply our ſelves unto Porters, Door-keepers, *&c.* In God there is no ſuch thing. In like manner, *Hom.* 12. in *Matth.* If we need not apply

ply our ſelves to Saints or Angels, much leſs to their Images.

Saint *Ambroſe*, C. 1. *ad Rom.* agreeth with Saint *Chryſoſtome* above, and ſpeaking of Idolaters, ſaith, They do not deny God, yet they ſerve the Creature, whereby they are not excuſed, but more accuſed, becauſe knowing God, *they honour him not as God.* And *de fuga ſeculi*, cap. ult. *Rachel* hid her Fathers Idols, ſo doth the Church; for ſhe knoweth not vain figures of Images, but underſtands the true ſubſtance of the Trinity. Let us then leave the ſhadow, who ſeek after the Sun.

Nazianz. in Paſcha Orat. 2. ſaith the ſame.

Saint *Jerome* in *Pſalm* 113. Doſt thou make a God with thine own hands to adore? If thou didſt adore a Beaſt, it were evil, yet a Beaſt hath Eyes and Feet, but that which thou adoreſt (with *latria*) neither ſeeth nor moveth.

In St. *Jerom's* and *Auſtin's* days, there no were Images in Churches, ſay *Caſſander*, *Conſult. de Imag. Polydore Virg. de Invent. rerum*, and *Eraſm.* in *Catech.*

I will add Saint *Auſtin* in *Pſalm* 113, & 114. The Holy Scriptures arm us againſt ſuch as ſay, I worſhip not this Viſible Image, but the *Numen* or Deity, that dwelleth in it, or as others, I neither worſhip Image nor any Spirit, but by the corporal Effigies or Picture, I ſee the ſign of that which I ought to worſhip. Saint *Paul* with one ſentence condemns both, who have *changed the truth of God into a lye, and ſerved the creature rather than the Creator*, &c. In the former part he condemns Images, in the latter their interpretations of Images, *Turn the truth into a lye.* But who prayeth looking on an Image, who is not ſo affected that he thinketh he is heard of it? and hopes he ſhall have what he deſireth? For this the outward figure of members extort from us, that the mind living in the body, thinketh the more that the body ſo like its own body hath ſenſe alſo. The like we find in his 49th Epiſtle, Who doubts that Idols want all ſenſe? yet when they are placed aloft in an honourable ſublimity by the very likeneſs of living members, although dead and without ſenſe, they affect our minds, the veneration of a multitude being added thereunto, which crazy and peſtilent diſtempers the Scripture healeth; ſaying, *They have eyes but ſee not.* Whether Images in Popiſh Churches have not the very ſame influence and effect on ignorant and ſuperſtitious Women, let impartial men and ſuch as have travelled abroad amongſt them determine. The ſame Saint

Auſtin

Auſtin, quoteth and commendeth a ſaying of *Varro*, that they who brought in Images for the People, both took away the Fear of a Deity (render'd baſe and contemptible by repreſentations of wood and ſtone) and added Error, *i. e.* falſe and unworthy apprehenſions of God. *De Civitat. Dei*, Lib. 4. c. 9. & 31.

To all this it will I ſuppoſe be anſwered: Firſt, That the Fathers inveigh againſt making Images of God, or falſe Gods, not Saints.

I reply: 1. Some of them expreſly condemn all Images. 2. Do not *Roman* Catholicks (though ſome of their own Writers condemn it) make Images or Pictures of God the Father in the likeneſs of an old Man, and of the Holy Ghoſt of a Dove? True, ſay they, but we do it not to repreſent the nature of God, but certain properties and actions appertaining to God: I do not wonder, they ſay they do not what cannot be done, to wit, to repreſent by an Image the infinite, inviſible and incomprehenſible nature of God; But herein they ſay what even the Heathens ſaid of their Idols. For *Hermes Triſmegiſtus* quoted by *Cyril*, *Xenophon* by *Minutius Fœlix*, *Olympius* by *Sozomen* confeſſed, that it is impoſſible to ſignifie the incorporeal God by a Body, and that the form of God cannot be ſeen, that inviſible Spirits or heavenly Powers dwelt in thoſe corporeal Images, but they were not the Powers themſelves. Hiſt. Lib. 7. c. 15.

It's granted, God and the Holy Ghoſt did appear in ſuch likeneſſes, what's that to us? We have an expreſs command not to make *to our ſelves* any likeneſs of any thing in Heaven, *&c.* Is not God the Father with the Holy Ghoſt in Heaven? *Ne facias niſi & tibi Deus juſſerit. Tertul. de Idololat.* c.

Secondly, They anſwer, that they give religious worſhip to Images not for themſelves, *propter ſe*, but for the ſake of the Perſons they repreſent. *V. Concil. Conſtant.* 6. Can. 82. *apud Caranzam.*

The Heathens, as we have ſeen above, ſaid the very ſame. If *Romiſh* worſhip of Images be lawful, it will be difficult to condemn or convince the Heathens of Idolatry. The *Jews* did not worſhip the Calf for it ſelf, but as a Repreſentative of God.

Laſtly, They affirm, that they yield to Images a mean, low and inferiour worſhip, not what belongs to God onely.

I anſwer that, as we have ſhewn above, they give to the Images of God and Crucifixes the ſame Divine worſhip they yield unto God and Chriſt themſelves. To ſay, they give Images *Latria*, and yet an inferiour kind of ſuch religious worſhip, is to contradict themſelves, for all *Latria* as ſuch is *ſummus cultus*, the higheſt worſhip a creature can give; if they give them an inferiour religious honour, it is not *Latria*.

Art. 6. Concerning the Popes Supremacy.

I come now to the Capital Article of the *Roman* Catholick Faith, The Popes Supremacy over all Emperors, Kings, Biſhops, Councils, Churches and Chriſtians throughout the World. Concerning the Fathers before the *Nicene* Council, called above 300 years after Chriſt, we need not make any ſtrict enquiry, ſeeing *Æneas Sylvius* (who was Pope himſelf afterwards) confeſſeth, that before this Council *aliqui, ſed non magnus*, ſome, but no great reſpect was given to the *Roman* Biſhops: in *Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tatianus*, *Athenagoras*, I find no mention of any Supremacy in the Biſhop of *Rome*.

Epiſt. 288.

Come we then to the Antient Father *Irenæus*. He in his third Book, *Cap.* 12. quoting the words of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, Acts 22, 23, 25. ſaith, Theſe are the words of that Church, from which every Church had *its beginning*. If every Church, then the *Roman*. How can ſhe then be *Mater, & Magiſtra*, the *Mother and Miſtris of all Churches*, as is now pretended by our *Romaniſts*? This was that *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Lyons* in *France*, who ſharply reproved *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, for threatning or attempting at leaſt to Excommunicate the Biſhops and Churches of *Aſia*, for not obſerving *Eaſter* on the ſame day he did, as *Euſebius* relateth.

☞

V. Epiſt. Concilii Conſtant. 1. c. 9. *Epiſt. ad Damaſum.*

Lib. 5. Hiſt. Eccl. c. 15.

At the ſame time lived *Polycrates* the renowned Biſhop of *Epheſus* (with whom many Catholick Biſhops meeting in ſeveral Councils concurred,) who oppoſed Pope *Victor*'s Sentence, and profeſſed he was not at all terrified with his threatned Excommunication, but reſolutely perſiſted in the Tradition and Cuſtom received from his Predeceſſors, particularly *John* the Evangeliſt, as we find in *Euſebius*, lib. 5. Hiſt. c. 23.

Hence

Hence it is evident that *Polycrates*, as alſo *Irenæus*, did not look upon the Biſhop of *Rome* as Prince and Sovereign Head of the Church, or more infallible than any other Biſhop. It's true, *Irenæus* had a great reverence for the *Roman* Church, and teſtifieth to her honour, that in his days the Apoſtolick Doctrine or Tradition remained pure and incorrupt, which he oppoſed to the Heretical Novelties of the *Valentinians*: But this no way proveth that ſhe had Supreme Juriſdiction over all Churches; But in regard it would be long, as he ſaith, to *reckon up all Apoſtolical Churches, as of* Corinth, Epheſus, *&c.* (to whom he giveth the ſame teſtimony of purity of doctrine) he inſtances in *Rome*, *propter potentiorem principalitatem, in regard of its more powerful principality*, known to all. But theſe words plainly enough relate not to the *Roman* Church immediately as a Chriſtian Church, but to the City of *Rome*, which at that time was the Imperial City and Head of the World. Alas! What powerful Principality could the poor perſecuted Church of *Rome* enjoy then, living under Heathen Emperours? It is not therefore meant ſtrictly and properly of an Eccleſiaſtical, but Civil Power and Principality of the City of *Rome*, in which the Church of *Rome* ſojourned, as St. *Ignatius* writeth to them, whereby through concourſe of all Nations, it was rendred more conſpicuous and honourable to the World. The words of *Æneas Sylvius* before mentioned confirm the ſame.

Lib. 3. cap. 3.

V. Concil. Chalcedon. infra. Epiſt. *ad Roman.*

In *Clemens Alexandrinus* I find nothing concerning this matter.

I will go on to *Tertullian*: *Run through*, ſaith he, *the Apoſtolical Churches. If ye be near* Achaia, *ye have* Corinth; *if* Macedonia, Philippi *and* Theſſalonica: *ſi Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam*; *If ye live near* Italy, *ye have* Rome. Where firſt obſerve, that he with *Irenæus* aſcribeth the ſame Authority to *Corinth*, *Philippi*, &c. which he doth to *Rome*. Secondly, He ſpeaketh not of Juriſdiction, but matter of Faith and Apoſtolick Doctrine. Thirdly, It's conditional, if you be near *Italy*, you have *Rome*. *Tertullian* never thought that all Chriſtian Churches were ſubject to *Rome*, either as to Doctrine or Government, or were bound to appeal and ſubmit unto her. Again, Chap. 20. The Apoſtles having firſt preached the Goſpel in *Judea* promulged the ſame doctrine

of Faith to the Nations. — In regard of this doctrine they are accounted Apostolical. — Wherefore so many and great Churches are that one *first Church* from the Apostles, of which all are. So all are first *omnes primæ*, and all Apostolical, whilst all prove one Unity; Now if all are first, all Apostolical, how can the *Roman* Church claim any Primacy or Principality over all, even Apostolical Churches?

Petra est omnis Christi imitator.

Origen in *Matth.* 16. Every Disciple of Christ is that Rock; If you think the Church to be built on *Peter onely*, what will become of *John* and the rest of the Apostles? What was spoken to *Peter* was spoken to all the Apostles and Christians. All are *Peter* and the Rock. The Keys were not onely given to *Peter*. This now at *Rome* is no less than Heresie. Let us hearken to Saint *Cyprian*, who usually wrote to Pope *Cornelius* as to his Brother, Colleague and Fellow-Bishop, not as his Prince and Sovereign, or Universal Bishop, especially in his 72. Epistle directed to him. 'In which matter we force no man, we give Law to no man, seeing every Bishop hath the free liberty of his own will in the administration or Government of his Church, being to give account of his actions (not to the Bishop of *Rome*, but) to God. In his Preface before the Council of *Carthage* he hath these words: *None of us maketh himself Bishop of Bishops* (i.e. Supreme Universal Bishop) *or compelleth his Colleagues by tyrannical terrour to obedience*, &c. where he seemeth to reflect on Pope *Stephen*. Compare those words of *Tertullian de Pudicit.* c. 10. The High Priest, the Bishop of Bishops (meaning the Bishop of *Rome*) saith, I absolve Adulterers: which no doubt he spake ironically and by way of irrision. In his Epistle 74. he writeth against Pope *Stephen*, charging him with Errour, and pleading the cause of Hereticks against the Church of God. Can any man believe *Cyprian* took Pope *Stephen* for his Supream Governour and infallible Head of all Churches? But *Firmilian* the famous Bishop of *Cappadocia* highly commended by *Baronius ad ann.* 258. *num.* 45. was not afraid to accuse the same Pope *Stephen* of open and manifest folly; who, saith he, glorying, *de Episcopatûs sui loco*, of his Episcopal Seat or Sea, and that he is Successour of Saint *Peter*, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid, maketh many Rocks and

Epist. 45. 47. 49.

Ejus errorem denotabis, qui Hæreticorum causam defendit.

Baronius ad Ann. 258. N. 47.

A Canonized Saint, *Menolog. Græc. in* Octob. 28.

Epist. 75.

and buildeth new Churches. He addeth alſo, that the *Roman* Church was guilty of violating the Antient Canons, and that Pope *Stephen* by Excommunicating ſo many Chriſtian Churches, Excommunicated himſelf. I will add that noted paſſage of St. *Cyprian, Idem cæteri quod Petrus*, &c. The reſt of the Apoſtles were the ſame with *Peter*, endowed with an equal fellowſhip or copartnerſhip of Honour and Power. They are all Paſtors, but the Flock is but one, which is to be fed by all (not *Peter* onely or his Succeſſours by vertue of *feed my ſheep*) by *unanimous conſent*, not by deputation by or ſubjection to *Peter* and ſuch as ſucceed him at *Rome*. A little before, he ſaith, Although Chriſt granted to all the Apoſtles after his Reſurrection *parem poteſtatem, equal power*, breathing on them the Holy Ghoſt, and ſaying, *whoſe ſins ye remit*, &c. Yet to *manifeſt Unity*, he appointed one Chair; He ſpeaketh to *Peter* and *to thee will I give*, &c. ſingularly; Why? not that *Peter* had a greater Power or Authority (which he expreſly denied before) than the reſt of the Apoſtles: but, ſaith Saint *Cyprian, to commend to us Unity*, that the Church ought to be one without Schiſm to the end of the World; which is the intent of all that Diſcourſe. Now, if Saint *Peter* had no Supremacy over all the Apoſtles and Churches, the Pope as deriving it from him can have juſt right to none. Let me add Saint *Cyprian's* 67. Epiſtle, where he adviſeth them what to do concerning the Heretical *French* Biſhop, whom he would not have the People to own, though he had ſurreptitiouſly obtained Pope *Stephens* confirmation. He addeth as a reaſon, We are many Paſtors, but we feed one Flock, and we ought to gather and ſuccour all the Sheep, yea, if any of our Society *è collegio noſtro*, i.e. *any Biſhop*, ſhould fall into Hereſie and rent the Church, the reſt ought to help; where he exempteth not any Biſhop, no not the Pope, from poſſibility of erring even Heretically, as to be ſure Pope *Liberius* and *Honorius* did.

Eos qui Romæ ſunt, non ea in omnibus obſervare, quæ ſunt ab origine tradita. De Unitate Eccleſ.

Pari conſortio prædicti honoris, & poteſtatis.

Although he ſaid before of *Peter, tibi dabo*, &c. *& ſuper illum unum ædificat Eccleſiam ſuam, & illi paſcendas mandat oves ſuas.*

V. Epiſt. 68.

Si hæreſin facere, & gregem Chriſti lacerare, & vaſtare tentaverit; ſubdeniant cæteri. Epiſt. 67.

In *Arnobius* and *Lactantius* I find nothing to our preſent purpoſe.

I paſs

I pass to Saint *Hilary*. This is the one immoveable foundation; this is the Rock of Faith confessed by Saint *Peter*, *Thou art Christ the Son of God*. Again, On this Rock of Confession the Church is built. This Faith is the foundation of the Church.

De Trinit. 12. Lib. 6. n. 674. *Hæc fides est Ecclesiæ fundamentum*, pag. 174.

In the same manner Saint *Chrysostome* often expounds the Rock, *Matth.* 16. of the ὁμολογία τῆς πίστεως, confession of the Deity of Christ made by *Peter* in the name of the rest of the Apostles.

In locum Hom. 55. *Christus ipse est Petra.* *Greg. M.* in Psalm. *Pœnitent.* 5. *Augustin.* in *Joann.* Epist. 1. Tract. 10.

Add *Theophylact*, Saint *Basil* of *Seleucia*, with others. *Basil* the Great, *Epist.* 82. ad *Athanasium* termeth *Athanasius*, in the name of the *Greeks* their Head, the leader and Prince of Ecclesiastical affairs, to whom they did fly for advice. Surely Saint *Athanasius* rather than the *Arian Heretick* Pope *Liberius* was like a Rock unshaken in those days.

See *Liberius* his Epistle to *Athanasius*, *Opera Athan.* Tom. 1. lib. 1. in *Jovinian.* c. 14.

Saint *Hierome* saith, the Church is built on the Apostles, *ex æquo*, equally, not on *Peter* principally or onely, much less on his Successours, and that at *Rome* rather than *Antioch*.

In 1. Epist. *Joan.* Tract. 10.

Saint *Austin* agreeth, *Quid est super hanc petram*, &c. What is it? *On this Rock will I build my Church*, *super hanc fidem*, on this Faith, *Thou art Christ the Son of God*.

But sparing at present particular testimonies: I shall shew that *all the four first General Councils*, either expresly or by consequence and implicitly have refuted and overthrown the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*. I begin with the first *Nicene* Council, *Can.* 6. where we read, Let the Antient Customs remain. The Bishop of *Alexandria* shall have the Government of the Churches of *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis*, *Quoniam Episcopo Romano parilis mos est*, Because the Bishop of *Rome* hath the like Custom, *i. e.* to govern *Rome* and the suburbicarian Region, as *Ruffinus* a *Roman* Presbyter understood it, and the precedent words plainly enough intimate. The Bishop of *Alexandria* is to govern his Diocess as the Bishop of *Rome* doth the Churches belonging to him of antient Custom. Here is a manifest limitation, or rather exclusion of the Bishop of *Romes* Universal Jurisdiction.

These *P. Gregory* the Great received as the four Gospels, *Lib.* 1. *Epist.* 24. all Popes are sworn to them. *Ad apicem observaturos* Can. *sicut* Dist. 16. Hist. lib. 6o. c 23. & l. 1. c. 6. *Roma Metropolis Romanæ ditionis. Athanas. ad solitar. vit. agentes.*

Baronius,

Baronius, Bellarmin and *Coriolanus* anſwer, that thoſe words, *becauſe the Biſhop of* Rome *hath the like Cuſtome*, means no more but this, becauſe the Biſhop of *Rome, conſuevit permittere*, hath uſed of old Cuſtom *to permit the Biſhop of* Alexandria *to govern thoſe Churches of* Egypt, *&c.*

A ſtrange gloſs and a mere begging of the Point in queſtion: As if the right of governing all Churches belonged to the Biſhop of *Rome*, when the Council as of antient Cuſtome, inviolable and equal to that of *Rome* (*parilis mos*) commit the government of thoſe Churches to the Biſhop of *Alexandria* as his antient Right, might not we ſay as well, that the Patriarch of *Alexandria* permitted the Pope to govern the Church of *Rome*? It is evident enough from this Canon, that the *Nicene* Fathers did not imagine that the Supreme Government of all Churches did belong to the Biſhop of *Rome*, or that the Patriarch of *Alexandria* needed to ſupplicate him for a Pall.

The firſt *Council of Conſtantinople*, Can. 2. forbids all Biſhops to encroach on the Dioceſſes of others leſt they confound the Churches: And *Can.* 5. they decree that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ought to have the *honour of Primacy next to the Biſhop of* Rome, *in regard it was new* Rome, to wit, made the Imperial City by *Conſtantine*, who called it after his own name *Conſtantinople*. Here we ſee the Biſhop of *Rome* is forbid as well as others ἀλλοτριοπισκοπεῖν, to play the Biſhop in other mens Dioceſes, and that the Council out of Reverence to antient cuſtome grants him a priority of Place or Order, not a ſuperiority of Power and Juriſdiction. The general *Council of Chalcedon* expounds and confirms this 5th Canon of *Conſtantinople*, who *Can.* 27. decree in theſe words: Following in all things the Decree of the 150 Fathers (to wit, in the Council of *Conſtantinople* before mentioned) we decree the ſame concerning the Priviledges of the moſt holy Church of *Conſtantinople*, which is *new Rome*. Their Reaſon is, for the Fathers Πατέρες, (not God the Father, nor Chriſt his Son, *Matth.* 16 16. but) the Fathers the Biſhops did of right give Priviledges to the Throne Eccleſiaſtical of *old Rome*, becauſe it was the Imperial City; and upon the ſame conſideration the 150 Biſhops (before mentioned) have granted to the Throne of *new Rome*, (*i. e. Conſtantinople*)

nople) ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal Priviledges*; rightly judging that the City which is honoured with the Empire and Senate, and enjoyeth equal Priviledges (*i.e.* Civil) with *old Rome* the Imperial City, ſhould alſo in matters Eccleſiaſtical be equally with her magnified and extolled, being the ſecond in order after her. Here we ſee plainly, Firſt, That the Church of *Conſtantinople* is in all Eccleſiaſtical matters and Priviledges equally extolled and magnified with *old Rome*. *Gratians* corruption of this Canon is abominable, for he tranſlates it thus: We Decree that the Seat of *Conſtantinople* may have, not ἴσα, *equal*, but *ſimilia*, *like* Priviledges with πρεσβυτίᾳ, not Senior, *old*, but *Superiour*, ſuperior *Rome*, *non tamen in Eccleſiaſticis magnificatur ut illa*, but *is not in Eccleſiaſtical matters magnified as ſhe is*; whereas in the *Greek* it's ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, *in Eccleſiaſtical matters* ſhall be equally extolled: An ignorant or ſhameleſs man. Secondly, Obſerve the reaſon why the Fathers in both Councils being near eight hundred Biſhops, granted Priviledges and Preeminences to the Biſhop of *old Rome*, was, becauſe it was the Imperial City, and upon the very ſame ground the Fathers in the Council of *Chalcedo.* judged it right and fit to grant the ſame and equal Priviledges to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, in regard it being made the Seat or Head of the Empire by the Emperour *Conſtantine*, it was *new Rome* or the Imperial City. Here is no mention made of any Divine Right granted by Chriſt to *Peter or* his Succeſſours at *Rome*. This Canon is of more weight than all the Decrees of Popes, and the Writings of all the Schoolmen and Jeſuits put together. It was confirmed in the ſixth General Council in *Trullo*, Can. 36. as alſo by the Emperours *Marcian*, *Juſtinian*, *Novel.* 115. cap. 3, *&c.*

In Edicto de Confir. Syn. Chalced. apud Binium, Tom. 3. p. 471. *Caranza*, p. 369.

Our Adverſaries alledg, that this Canon was ſurreptitiouſly obtained by the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, *Anatolius*, when the Biſhop of *Romes* Legates with others were gone out of the Council.

But *Caranza*, a Popiſh Collector of the Councils informs us, that upon this complaint made by the Legates, the Canon was debated the ſecond time, and confirmed by the Biſhops in Council; ſo much doth *Binius*, *Concil. Tom.* 3. *p.* 404. & 463. acknowledgeth alſo; yea, the Biſhop of *Rome* is deſired

fired by the Council to conſent to it, as *Baronius* himſelf confeſſeth.

I haſten to the *General Council of Epheſus*, where upon complaint of the Biſhops of *Cyprus*, that the Patriarch of *Antioch* claimed a Power to ordain their Biſhops contrary to antient cuſtome, the Fathers decree that they ſhould enjoy their antient right, adding a Canon, whereby they forbid any Biſhop, not excepting the *Roman*, to invade the Dioceſes of others — leſt *the Statutes of the Fathers be broken, and under pretence of the ſacred function the tumour of ſecular power ſhould creep in, and ſo unadviſedly by little and little we loſe our liberty which Chriſt hath purchaſed by his own bloud.* Thus thoſe Reverend Biſhops decreed, as if by a Prophetical Spirit they had foreſeen the future Captivity of the Church under the ſubtle Uſurpation and tyranny of Popery. *V. Bernard. ad Eugenium de Conſid. lib. 3.*

The anſwer given by the Proctors of the *Romiſh* Court to this Canon, as that of *Chalcedon*, or any other that oppoſeth their Dominion, is: The moſt holy Church of *Rome* approveth or receiveth not that Council or Canon; for all Councils, ſaith their great Cardinal *Baronius*, have more or leſs Authority as they are approved or not allowed by the *Roman* Church or Pope. An Anſwer which ſcarcely deſerves a reply, and ſheweth what eſteem our *Romaniſts* have of even General Councils, if they croſs their ambitious deſigns. *Hunc Canonem Eccleſia Romana non recipit. Coriolanus*, p. 285. *Ad* An. 381. l. 38.

I cannot omit that famous Synodical Epiſtle ſent by the Biſhops of *Africa*, of whom St. *Auſtin* was one, to the Biſhop of *Rome*, Pope *Celeſtine*, which is an invincible Bulwark or Sea-wall againſt the inundation of Papal Supremacy. It would be tedious to tranſcribe the whole Letter which is ſtill extant, and written directly againſt this new Article of, not Catholick, but *Roman*, Faith. They firſt deſire the Pope not eaſily to give Audience to ſuch as appealed from them to him, or to receive into his Communion ſuch as they had (as *Apiarius* a moſt ſcandalous Presbyter amongſt others) deſervedly excommunicated. Which was, ſay they, contrary to the *Nicene* Canons, which reſpect Biſhops as well as inferiour Clericks. They tell him, that the Canons of the Church had prudently provided, that all Controverſies ſhould be determined in the places where they aroſe, where the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt would not be wanting to direct, unleſs any *Codic. Canon. Eccleſiæ Africanæ in fine.* *Ab aliis excommunicati, ab aliis ad communionem ne recipiantur ſine ſynodo provinciali. Concil. Nicæn.* Can. 5.

one can believe that God will inſpire any *one man* (the Pope) with Juſtice (*i. e.* juſt or right judgment) and deny it to multitudes of Prieſts met in Council. The *African* Biſhops thought no Chriſtian man could believe this: but there are *Roman* Catholicks who have made it an unqueſtionable truth, that though all Councils may err, yet the Pope being infallibly aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt, cannot. The *African* Fathers go on — How can a tranſmarine Sentence (at *Rome*) be firm and good, to which the neceſſary preſence of Witneſſes, either in regard of Sex or infirmity of Age, and many other impediments cannot be had? That any ſhould be ſent from your ſide (as Legates ſuppoſe *à Latere*) we do not find in any Council of Fathers, nor in the authentick Canons of the *Nicene*. Do not ſend upon any ones requeſt your Clericks as inforcers (to wit, of your Sentence upon Appeals) leſt we ſeem to bring the ſmoaky Pride of the World into the Church. So theſe holy Biſhops (I had almoſt ſaid, Prophets) without fear or flattery, wrote of old to Chriſt's Univerſal Vicar at *Rome*. As for the condemning Appeals to the Pope, therein they trod in their ſteps, and uſe almoſt the very words of Saint *Cyprian* Biſhop of *Carthage*, and his Colleagues to *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, to whom he wrote in this manner: *Cum ſtatutum ſit ab omnibus nobis*, &c. *Whereas it is decreed by all of us* (in ſome National Council of *Africa*) *and is both juſt and fit, that every cauſe Eccleſiaſtical ſhould be there heard where the fault was committed, and to all Paſtors a part*, portio gregis, *of the flock of Chriſt* (not all the flock to one) *is entruſted, which every one ought to rule as he that muſt give an account to God* (not the Biſhop of *Rome, Cornelius*) *it becometh not thoſe whom we are over, to run about to other Churches* (aiming particularly at the *Roman*) *and by their ſubtle and fallacious raſhneſs to divide the Concord of Biſhops, and diſſolve the Unity of the Church, but there to plead their cauſe where Witneſſes and Accuſers may be produced againſt them.* The ſame St. *Cyprian* in another Epiſtle adviſeth and encourageth the People of *Spain*, not to receive *Baſilides* again as their Biſhop, although he had been at *Rome* with Pope *Stephen*, by whom he was (he ſaith) *unjuſtly* and as he ſuppoſed, in a ſurreptitious manner reſtored (for he had been depoſed) to his Biſhoprick. Can any one now believe

V. Cyprian. Epiſt. 55.

Epiſt. 55. *vel* Lib. 10. Epiſt. 3. *ad Cornelium.*

Epiſt. 68.

lieve that Saint *Cyprian* held the ſupreme Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* over all Biſhops and Churches to be his lawful right, or which is more incredible, an Article of the antient Primitive and Apoſtolick Faith, as Pope *Pius* hath declared it? Surely he muſt then be a Perſon of very Catholick, *i. e.* Univerſal Faith to believe any thing. And what did *Henry* VIII. as other Kings of *England* before him, worſe than Saint *Auſtin* and the whole *African* Church in forbidding Appeals, and forbidding his Legates in their own Kingdom? Why might not *England* do this as well as *Africa*? Well, however our Adverſaries will reliſh it, the Council of *Milevis* (another *African* Council) forbad all Appeals to tranſmarine Churches (aiming no doubt eſpecially at *Rome*) under pain of Excommunication out of all the Churches of *Africa*; and another at *Carthage*, decreed that no Biſhop whoſoever, no not the *Roman*, ſhould be called the *Prince of Biſhops*, but onely the *Biſhop* of the *firſt Seat* or *See*. *Gratian* the *Roman* Canoniſt of his excellent faculty of tranſlating, giveth us the meaning of the Canon thus: That no Biſhop is to be called the *Prince of Biſhops*, but the *Biſhop of the firſt Seat*, i. e. the Pope. *Gloſſa quæ corrumpit textum.*

Hen. 1. *Hen.* 2. *apud Matth. Pariſien.*

Can. 22.

Concil. Carthag. 3. Can. 26.

I will onely add the Teſtimonies of two Biſhops of *Rome*: The former is *Pelagius* the 2d. who writing to his Rival for the Supremacy, the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſaith, *Nullus Patriarcharum*, &c. none of the Patriarchs (and ſo neither the *Roman*) may uſe or aſſume the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*, for hereby the name of Patriarch is indeed taken from all the reſt; which, ſaith he, far be it from the thought of any faithful Chriſtian. This is upon Record in the Popes Canon Law.

Gregor. lib. 4. Epiſt. 36. & 38.

But his Succeſſor Pope *Gregory* the Great, ſpeaketh out more plainly, who, writing to the Empreſs againſt *John Biſhop of Conſtantinople* his Rival, ſaith, — In this his Pride (in affecting the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*) appeareth the approach of Antichriſt. Wherefore, I beſeech you by the Almighty God, give not any conſent to this perverſe Title. In like manner, *Epiſt.* 32. to the Emperor, — *Peter* himſelf is not called the Univerſal Apoſtle, (*Feed my ſheep*, it ſeems proveth it not.) None of the *Roman* Biſhops ever aſſumed,

Diſt. 99. Cap. *Nullus Patriarcharum.* Lib. 4. Epiſt. 34.

Lib. 4. Epiſt. 38. *ad Joann. Conſtantin.* *In iſto ſceleſto vocabulo conſentire, nihil eſt aliud quam fidem perdere. Greg. M. ad Sabinian.* lib. 4. Indict. 13. Epiſt. 39.

though offer'd to them, this name of Singularity, or conſented to uſe it (as Popes now do.) And who is he who *contrary* to the *Goſpel* and the *Decrees* of the *Canons*, preſumeth to take upon him this fooliſh and proud Name? Did ever any Proteſtant inveigh more bitterly againſt the Popes Univerſal Epiſcopacy? I would gladly know whether both parts of a contradiction can be true. Whether the antient or modern *Roman* Biſhops, or both, be infallible? Do not the modern Popes aſſume and earneſtly contend for this fooliſh, proud and Antichriſtian Name? And leſt we ſhould imagine, that Pope *Gregory* condemn'd this Name in other Patriarchs only, not as to himſelf, he addeth in the before-mentioned Epiſtle to *Mauritius* the Emperour, Gracious Lord, *Nunquid hac in re propriam cauſam defendo*, &c. Do I in this ſpeak for my ſelf, or plead my own cauſe, and not rather the cauſe of the whole Church? Where note, he acknowledgeth the Emperour to be his Lord, and to whoſe judgment he is willing to refer the whole cauſe. Did Pope *Gregory* make the Emperour ſupreme Judge in an Article of Faith? Let Papiſts judge. Notwithſtanding all this zeal his ſucceſſor *Boniface* ſoon after, *Ann.* 607. as *Sigebert*, *Marianus Scotus*, *Martinus Polonus* and other Hiſtorians teſtifie, by the favour of that execrable Regicide *Phocas* obtained this proud, fooliſh and prophane Title, and the preſent Pope, not onely owneth the Name, but contrary to the judgment of his Predeceſſors (who are ſuppoſed to have been infallible) executeth an Univerſal juriſdiction over all Princes, Biſhops, Churches (as far as he is able) to the diminution, yea almoſt abrogation of their due Rights, Priviledges and Authority, as *Marcus Antonius de Dominis* Arch-biſhop of *Spalato* juſtly complained. So much for the Popes Supremacy.

Lib. 7. Epiſt. 30. *ad Eulogium*; he rejects the name given to himſelf.

Epiſt. 32. *ad Maurit.* & lib. 2. Epiſt. 61. *ad Maur.* *Beda de ætate Anaſtaſ.* *vita Bonifacii* 3. *Ad. Chron.* l. 1. *In Præfat. Reipub. Eccl.*

Art. 7. Concerning the ſacrifice of the Maſs. *Chriſtus in ſeipſo immortaliter vivens, iterum in hoc Myſterio moritur. Greg. M. de Concil.* Diſt. 2. *Quid ſit.*

The next Article is the *proper and real Sacrificing Chriſt, his very Body and Bloud in the Maſs by the Prieſt, as a Propitiation for the ſins both of quick and dead.* This Error in all probability aroſe from want of a diſcreet underſtanding of ſome Rhetorical or Hyperbolical expreſſions uſed by the Antient Fathers in their popular Sermons and Diſcourſes concerning the Sacrament of Chriſt's death and Paſſion. But that it was no part of their Faith, to believe that Chriſt

is really and properly sacrificed in the Mass, we shall evidently prove out of their own Writings.

I shall begin with *Justin Martyr*, who discoursing of the Holy Eucharist, sheweth how the Christians then used to offer Bread and Wine to the προεστὼς, or Minister, who receiving them, offereth up to God (not Christ himself, but) Glory, Thanks and Praise for those his gifts (*i. e.* Bread, and Wine) which after the Ministers Prayers and Thanksgivings are distributed to every one that is present. Where note, First, They termed Bread and Wine after the Ministers Prayers or Consecration: Secondly, Both Bread and Wine were given to all present; not Bread onely, much less neither one nor the other, as in Private Masses. But of sacrificing or offering up Christ himself to God, he hath not a word in that place. The same Father in his *Dialogue* with *Trypho* the *Jew*, treateth at large concerning the abrogation of the *Jewish* Sacrifices; and coming to mention the Christian Sacrifice, which *Malachy* foretold should be offered up to God by the *Gentiles* in every place: he interprets it (as *Tertullian*, *Eusebius*, and the rest of the Fathers do) of Prayers and Praises; *Which*, saith he, *I account the onely perfect sacrifices pleasing to God.* Which Spiritual Sacrifices a little after he opposeth to all the Sacrifices, Offerings and Oblations of the Law. Surely, had Saint *Justin* believed that in the Eucharist Christ himself, his Body and Bloud were by the Priest really and properly sacrificed to God, he would no doubt have made mention of this Christian Sacrifice, far exceeding in virtue and value, no onely all *Jewish* Offerings, but the Prayers and Thanksgivings of all Christians: at least he would never have affirmed, that the latter were in his opinion the *onely perfect Sacrifices* under the Gospel pleasing to God. But he is altogether silent as to any such Sacrifice; yea, contrarily in that very place he addeth, That *these onely Sacrifices*, to wit, Prayers and Praises Christians have learned to make, and that in or at the commemoration or remembrance of their alimony both wet and dry (*i. e.* the Eucharistical Bread and Wine) in which they *remember* the Passion *of Christ*. Where it is remarkable that *Justin Martyr*, instead of proper sacrificing of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, mentions onely the Commemoration or Memorial of

Apol. *ad Antonin.*

Ἀρχιερατικὸν ἔσμεν γένος ὡς Θεὸς μαρτυρεῖ. Mal. 1. 11. which relates to all Christians.

Ἀναπέμπει.

P. 201.

Ἀρτὸν καὶ οἶνον. In Dialog. *pag.* 270.

of his Paſſion, and that the Prayers and Thankſgivings attending it (for it's called the *Euchariſt*, ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας) were the *onely Sacrifices* Chriſtians had learned in that moſt ſolemn Office of Religion to offer up to God. So much for *Juſtin.*

Lib. 4. c. 32. 33, 34.

I paſs on to St. *Irenæus*, who acknowledgeth that Chriſt teaching his Diſciples to offer to God Firſt-fruits of his Creatures, leſt they ſhould ſeem ungrateful, took that Bread, which is of the creature or Creation (κτίσεως, poſſibly was the word) and gave thanks, and ſaid, *This is my Body.* In like manner the Cup of Wine, which is of the creature (*i. e.* the *Vine*) confeſſing it to be his Bloud, and taught the Oblation of the new Teſtament, which the Church receiving from the Apoſtles offereth to God throughout the World, to him who granteth to us the Firſt-fruits of his Gifts in the New Teſtament. Here we find an Oblation, but not a Sacrifice (which two, as *Bellarmine* obſerveth, are different things) much leſs a ſacrifice of Chriſts Body and Bloud. *Irenæus* plainly ſheweth what kind of Oblation he meant, when he declareth it to be not of Chriſt the Creator, but of Gods creatures, to wit, Bread and Wine, which the Church offers to God. (*Bellarmine* grants this) Firſt, as an expreſſion of honour, love and gratitude to him for his creatures bountifully beſtowed on us for our ſuſtenance. Secondly, That out of a part of them, to wit, Bread and Wine ſet on Gods Table or Altar, by the prayers of the Prieſt they might become ſacramentally and myſtically his Body and Bloud. Thirdly, That out of the remains the poor might be relieved. Theſe Oblations Saint *Cyprian* after him calleth in an improper ſenſe *Sacrifices*, *In Dominicum ſine ſacrificio venis?* Doſt thou come, ſpeaking to a rich Widow, to Church without a Sacrifice, *i. e.* Oblation? Theſe Oblations of Bread and Wine offered up to God, in a way of grateful acknowledgment of his mercies, out of which the ſacramental Elements were of old taken, are the Oblation of the New Teſtament taught by Chriſt, and obſerved by the Primitive Chriſtians. That this was his true ſenſe and meaning appeareth plainly from the next Chapter, where having quoted the Prophecy of *Malachy*, concerning the pure Incenſe and Offering of the *Gentiles* (a place urged by our Adverſaries for their Maſs-Sacrifice)

De Miſſa. l. 1. c 2.

De Euchar. lib. 10. c. 27. *V. Litur. Chryſoſt.*

Serm. *de Eleemoſyna.* *V. Canonem Miſſæ* and *D.* Field, in Append. *p.* 212.

Cap. 33.

Sacrifice) he expounds it according to *Revel.* 8. 3. of the Prayers of Saints; and in the next Chapter diſcourſing of this Oblation which our Saviour taught to be offered in all places throughout the World, which is accounted by God a pure Sacrifice; he applieth to it thoſe words: *If thou bringeſt thy gift to the Altar,* &c. which Gift was never underſtood by any of Chriſts Body and Bloud, which according to our *Romaniſts* own Doctrine, none but Prieſts, not private Chriſtians, offer at Gods Altar. To this he ſubjoineth the words of God by *Moſes*; *Thou ſhalt not appear before the Lord empty,* i.e. without an Oblation; For gifts, ſaith he, teſtifie love and honour of the Perſon to whom they are preſented. Then he addeth, In regard the Church offereth with Simplicity, her Oblation is juſtly accounted by God a pure Sacrifice, as Saint *Paul* writeth to the *Philippians* of their Oblations, *i. e. Alms*, ſent to him, terming them an Offering pleaſing to God; For it becometh us, ſaith *Irenæus*, to make an Oblation to God, and in all things to be found *grateful* unto the Creator —— offering *primitias creaturarum ejus* (not his Son, but) *the firſt-fruits of his Creatures.*

Cap. 34. Matth. 5. Cap. 34. Phil. 4. 18.

The Synagogue of the *Jews* offereth not thus, in regard they have not received the word (Chriſt) by whom it is to be offered to God; in which reſpect it is termed a New Oblation of the Church. However then our Adverſaries boaſt much of *Irenæus* as owning their Sacrifice of the Maſs; it is evident to any who will weigh the whole Context of his Diſcourſe, that he ſaith nothing in the leaſt of ſacrificing Chriſt in the Sacrament, but of Oblations and Alms, which are ſtill uſed in our Churches at the Offertory when the Euchariſt is celebrated.

Let us now proceed to *Tertullian*, who againſt *Marcion* expounds *Malachy's clean* or *pure Sacrifice*, of giving Glory, Bleſſing and Praiſe to God; and in another place of Simple or pure Prayer from a pure Conſcience, *Lib.* 4. in *Marc. c.* 1. In like manner, *ad Scapulam*, written in defence of the Chriſtians who were accuſed, becauſe they did not offer up (as the *Gentiles*) any Sacrifice for the life of the Emperour, He anſwereth, We do ſacrifice for the Emperour, but as God hath commanded, *purâ prece, with pure Prayer.* Why doth he not ſay, (which *Bellarmine* granteth, *de Miſſa*, l. 2. c. 6. might

Lib. 3. cap 22. *Gloriæ Relatio, Benedictio, & Laus & Hymni, &* Lib. 4. c. 1. *Simplex Oratio de Conſcientia pura. Purâ prece.*

might lawfully have been done) we offer up for him a moſt perfect and venerable Sacrifice of the Body and Bloud of the Son of God. It ſeemeth he was ignorant of this Maſs-Sacrifice. *Clemens Alexand.* diſcourſing much about Heatheniſh and Jewiſh Sacrifices, addeth, We Chriſtians honour God with our Prayers, and this moſt excellent Sacrifice we preſent unto him. And a little after, The Sacrifice of the Chriſtian Church is ſpeech, λόγος, breathed out from holy Souls.

V. Tertul. adv. Judæos, c. 5.

Strom. 7. p. 717. τιμῶμεν τὸν θεὸν δι' εὐχῆς, &c.

I will add *Lactantius*, *Summus colendi Dei ritus*, &c. The higheſt rite or office of worſhip to God, is praiſe from the mouth of a righteous Man. Would he or *Clemens* have advanced Prayer or Praiſe above the Sacrifice of Chriſt in the Maſs, had they believed it? But I muſt not forget Saint *Cyprian*, *ad Luc.* where he ſaith, *Chriſt offered himſelf* to God a Sacrifice, and commanded the Euchariſt to be celebrated in commemoration or remembrance of him. It is the Paſſion of our Lord which is the Sacrifice we offer; wherefore, as often as we offer the Cup in remembrance of the Lord and his Paſſion, we ought to do what he did before us. Which laſt words confute the Romiſh Half-communion. Surely, if the Paſſion of Chriſt on the Croſs be the Sacrifice we offer to God, evident it is, that it can be offered only by way of commemoration or remembrance; for Chriſt ſuffered but once on the Croſs, which was performed above 1600 years ago. How can that very Paſſion be really and properly reiterated or acted over again, unleſs by way of repreſentation and commemoration? But if the Sacrifice of the Maſs be onely a repreſentation or commemoration of Chriſts Paſſion, then it cannot be a proper Sacrifice, but improper and by ſimilitude onely, as the Picture of the Paſſion of a Martyr is not really and properly the Paſſion it ſelf.

Inſtit. lib. 6. cap. ult.

Epiſt. 63.

Add *Cyprian de Unctione Chriſmatis. In menſa Panem & Vinum, in cruce militibus Corpus vulnerandum tradit. Vino Chriſti ſanguis oſtenditur. Aqua ſola Chriſti ſanguinem non poteſt exprimere. Cypr.* Epiſt. 17.

V. Lactant. Inſtit. *p.* 1. *c.* 1.

I come now to *Euſebius* the learned Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, who teacheth us, that the Sacrifice of Chriſt himſelf was prefigured by all the Jewiſh Sacrifices, of which Chriſtians make in the Euchariſt a continual remembrance, as he often repeateth it. But concerning ſacrificing Chriſt again and again by the Prieſt we find not a word. Yea, in the ſame place he ſaith, That Chriſtians offer up μνήμην ἀντὶ θυσίας, the

ὑπόμνησιν, Lib. 1. *de* Demonſtr. Evang. *c.* 10.

V. Euſeb. de Laudib. Conſtantini, pag. 488.

the *memory or memorial of Chriſts ſacrifice on the Croſs inſtead of a ſacrifice to God*; which Memorial ſaith, we celebrate *ſignis quibuſdam*, by certain ſigns, to wit, Bread and Wine on the Holy Table, wherein we offer up to God unbloudy and rational Sacrifices ἀναιμάτους καὶ ἀναίμους, incorporeal and without bloud, by his moſt eminent High-Prieſt Jeſus Chriſt, *i. e.* Prayers and Praiſes. He ſaith not, We offer Jeſus Chriſt the High-Prieſt, but we offer up other Sacrifices by him. Neither by incorporeal and unbloudy Sacrifices in the plural, could he intend offering up Chriſts Body and Bloud; for how poſſibly can Chriſts Body be incorporeal or his bloud without bloud? A little after, he explaineth more fully what he meaneth by thoſe Rational, Incorporeal or ſpiritual Sacrifices, to wit, the ſacrifices of Prayer and Praiſe; to which purpoſe he quoteth the words of *David*: *Offer unto God thankſgiving*, &c. and thoſe of *Malachy* above-mentioned, concerning *pure Incenſe*, i. e. Prayer, and a pure Offering, *i.e.* ſaith he, A broken and contrite heart. He concludeth in theſe words: We ſacrifice and offer Incenſe ſometimes by celebrating the memory, μνήμην, of that great Sacrifice, (to wit, of Chriſt on the Croſs) by thoſe ſacramental Myſteries, which he hath delivered to us, giving thanks to God for our Redemption, and offering Hymns and Praiſes to him. (The ſame do Proteſtants) otherwiſe by conſecrating and devoting our ſelves to God, and dedicating Soul and Body to his High-Prieſt, the Word. Ye ſee here how many ſorts of Chriſtian Sacrifices *Euſebius* reckons up, Prayers, Praiſes, conſecrating our ſouls and bodies to God, celebrating the memory of his Sacrifice on the Croſs; but concerning ſacrificing of Chriſt himſelf in and by the ſacramental Myſteries, we find nothing. Can this now be a point of Catholick Faith, of which *Euſebius* and all the antient Fathers were ignorant? The ſame *Euſebius* in another place diſcourſeth concerning Chriſts Prieſthood according to the order of *Melchizedeck*. His words are: In like manner, firſt our Saviour, then the Prieſts of, or from him exerciſing a ſpiritual Prieſthood, by Bread and Wine, do obſcurely repreſent the Myſteries of his Body and Bloud. This maketh nothing for the Popiſh Maſs-ſacrifice. For firſt, *Melchizedeck*, as he ſaid a little before, ἐξήνεγκε, *protulit* (as the vulgar

Pſalm 50.

Lib. 5. c. 3.

V. Tertul. cont. Judæos. Ambroſ. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 3.

tranſlation rendreth it) *brought forth* to *Abraham* Bread and Wine, but offered *obtulit*, no corporal Sacrifices. The truth is, the Maſs-Prieſts, if Tranſubſtantiation be admitted, offer neither Bread nor Wine, which they tell us are changed into Chriſts Body and Bloud, which are corporal things. But the Chriſtian Prieſthood ſaith *Euſebius*, is ſpiritual, ſo therefore are their Sacrifices alſo. Secondly, All that *Euſebius* ſaith of the Executors of this ſpiritual Prieſthood, is, that after Chriſts Example by Bread and Wine (which he ſuppoſeth to remain in their ſubſtance) they obſcurely repreſent Chriſts Body and Bloud. Doth this imply, that the Bread and Wine are miraculouſly changed into the body and bloud of Chriſt? or that repreſenting Chriſts body and bloud in the Holy Sacrament rendreth them a Sacrifice, or implieth any offering them up as a propitiatory Victim for the ſins both of quick and dead? Certainly, did this ſacrificing Chriſt by or under Bread and Wine at all appertain to the Chriſtian Prieſthood, *Euſebius* no doubt would have (it being ſo eminent and wonderful an action) made at leaſt ſome little mention of it. But how could he mention that which it appeareth he was wholly ignorant of, to wit, the ſacrificing Chriſt by Prieſts in the Holy Euchariſt?

Orat. 3. in *Arian.* *Athanaſius* in a few words giveth the Sacrifice of the Maſs a deadly blow. The Sacrifice of our Saviour *once offered* perfects all, and remaineth firm all times. *Aaron* had Succeſſors, our Lord had none. Saint *Chryſoſtome adv. Judæos Hom.* 36. expounds *Malachy's Pure* Offering of Prayer; and *Hom.* in *Pſalm* 95. reckoning up about ten ſorts of Sacrifices in the Chriſtian Church, as Martyrdom, Prayer, Alms, *&c.* he taketh no notice of the Sacrifice of all Sacrifices, to wit, of Chriſt in the Maſs. But that noted place, *Hom.* 17. on the *Hebrews* muſt not be omitted; where having firſt ſaid, that Jeſus Chriſt is both Prieſt and Sacrifice, who offer'd himſelf to God once for all, for us; he raiſeth an Objection againſt what he had ſaid from Saint *Paul*, What then do we Prieſts? Do not we daily offer? He anſwereth, We do indeed offer, but it is making a remembrance of his death, we do it in commemoration of what is already done; we do offer the ſame Sacrifice μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα τῆς θυσίας or rather (correcting himſelf

Heb. 10. 10.

V. Baſil. M. in Cap. 1. *Eſaiæ.*

that

that he might ſpeak more properly and exactly,) We celebrate or operate the *remembrance of* a Sacrifice, *i. e.* of Chriſt on the Croſs, *commemorantes, & memoriam facientes*, as the *Roman* Miſſal it ſelf ſpeaketh.

Saint *Ambroſe* in his Comment on the *Hebrews* ſaith the very ſame, as if he had tranſlated Saint *Chryſoſtome*: Do not we daily offer? Yes, We offer *memoriam facientes, making in and by the Euchariſt a memorial of his death.* We offer him (Chriſt) *magis autem ſacrificii recordationem operamur*, Rather or more properly, we make *a remembrance of a Sacrifice.* In another place he ſets down the antient forms of Conſecration; Wherefore being mindful of his Paſſion (*i. e.* Chriſt on the Croſs) we offer to thee this Sacrifice — this bread. Bread, not the very Body of Chriſt in a carnal and corporeal ſenſe. The like words we find in Saint *Chryſoſtomes* and the *Gregorian* Liturgies. Cap. 10. Lib. 4. *de Sacra.* c. 6. *V. Canonem Miſſæ Rom.*

I will now add *Epiphanius*, who ſaith, as *Athanaſius* above, Chriſt hath no Succeſſour in his Prieſthood, that he is both Prieſt and Sacrifice, in regard none can properly ſacrifice him but himſelf, which he did *once for all on the Croſs.* And *Hær.* 42. Chriſt by his Sacrifice hath taken away the uſe of all Sacrifices (*i. e.* properly ſo called) under the Goſpel. In like manner Saint *Cyril* of *Alexandria* againſt *Julian* the Apoſtate, who objected that the Chriſtians had no Sacrifice: For anſwer, he aſſerts not any external, viſible and corporeal one, but νοητὴν καὶ ἄϋλον, an intellectual and ſpiritual Worſhip; for, ſaith he, a moſt immaterial and ſpiritual Sacrifice becometh God, who is in his nature pure and immaterial. *Hær.* 55. Lib. 9. *cont. Julian.* νοητὴν καὶ πνευματικὴν λατρείαν.

I will end with Saint *Auſtin*, who in his 20th Book againſt *Fauſtus* thus writeth: Chriſtians celebrate the memory of this finiſhed Sacrifice, (to wit, of Chriſt on the Croſs) by the Holy Oblation or Sacrament, *i. e.* of Bread and Wine, and by participation of the body and bloud of Chriſt; not by immolation, but participation of them; not by reiteration of Chriſts Sacrifice which is finiſhed (*conſummatum eſt*) but commemoration of it. And *Chap.* 21. he hath theſe words: The fleſh and bloud of this Sacrifice of Chriſt before his Incarnation was promiſed or repreſented by the ſimilitude of Levitical Sacrifices: In the Paſſion of Chriſt it was performed *per ipſam veritatem*, by *the very truth of the thing* Ch. 18. Lib 20. *contr. Fauſt.* c. 21. The like he hath *de fide, ad Petrum Diacon.* c. 19.

it ſelf: After his Aſcenſion, it is celebrated *per ſacramentum memoriæ*, by a *Sacrament of memory, or commemoration*, not by a true proper Sacrifice of Chriſt, *per ipſam veritatem*, and immolation of his very body and bloud, as *Romaniſts* affirm. In his Epiſtle to *Boniface*, he expreſſeth it more clearly. Is not Chriſt immolated or offer'd up once *in ſemetipſo*, in himſelf, *i. e.* his own body and bloud really, and yet in the Sacrament, not onely every *Eaſter*, but every day, *quotidie populis immolatur*, he is immolated or offer'd to the people. He ſaith not to God, but to the people. For Sacraments, if they had not ſome ſimilitude, *ſimilitudinem*, of thoſe things whereof they are Sacraments, they could not at all be Sacraments. Hence the names of the things ſignified are communicated to them. Here Saint *Auſtin* plainly affirmeth, that Chriſts body and bloud are immolated or offer'd up in and by the ſacramental Signs, not really, properly and ſubſtantially, but *per ſimilitudinem*, by way of ſimilitude or repreſentation, in regard the ſacramental Symbols as he ſaith, *ſecundum quendam modum*, after ſome manner, not proper but figurative, are his body and bloud; or as Saint *Ambroſe* hath it, *in imagine, in an Image or repreſentation*, but there (in He[illegible]at Gods right hand) *in veritate*, in truth; where he pre[illegible] his very body and bloud by way of interpellation to [illegible]e Eyes of his Father as our Advocate. In another place,-As often as the Paſcha, the Chriſtian Paſsover is offer'd, doth Chriſt ſo often die? No: yet *anniverſaria recordatio quaſi repræſentat quod olim factum eſt*, *The Anniverſary recordation at* Eaſter, *doth as it were repreſent what was done long ſince*; and ſo admoniſheth us as if we ſaw Chriſt hanging on the Croſs. So much for ſacrificing Chriſt in [illegible]e Maſs, or Sacrament, which the antient Fathers own not; allowing only with Proteſtants an improper offering of him by way of Image, repreſentation, ſimilitude, memorial and communication.

Quod natum eſt ex Virgine nobis quotidie naſcitur & crucifigitur. Hieron. in Pſal. 86. & 97.

Epiſt. 23.

Lib. 1. *de Offic.* c. 48. & in Pſal. 38.

In Pſal. 21. Compare *in* Pſalm 75.

Memoriâ quotidie nobis immolatur.

Cùm hoſtia frangitur, & ſanguis in ora fidelium infunditur, quid aliud quam Dominici corporis immolatio ſignificatur, Aug. de Conſ. diſt. 2.

I come

I come to the laſt Article before-mentioned of the new *Roman* Creed, *Receiving the Communion in one kind in bread onely.* Here it is needleſs to quote many Teſtimonies, ſeeing our Adverſaries themſelves confeſs, that herein they have departed from the practice of all the antient Fathers. We have already ſeen in *Juſtin Martyr*, that both Bread and Wine were adminiſtred to all that were preſent at the Sacrament; yea, he there informs us that the Deacon carried ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον, conſecrated Bread and Wine to ſuch as were ſick and abſent. In *Cyprian*'s days it's undeniable, that the Sacramental Cup was given to the people, yea Infants. *Bibimus de ſanguine Domini ipſo jubente*, Chriſt commanding us, we drink of his Bloud. I might alledge *Ignatius ad Philadelph. Origen* Hom. 16. in Num. *Tertul. ad Uxorem*, lib. 2. *Cyril Hieroſol. Catech.* &c. *Ambroſe* lib. 1. *de Offic.* c. 41. *de Sacrament.* l. 4. c. 4. *Jerome in Sophon.* c. 3. & 1 *Cor.* 11. *Chryſ.* Hom. 18. in 2. *ad Corint. Theodoret* in 1 *Cor.* 11. *Auſtin* in *Levit.* qu. *Theophylact.* 1 *Cor.* 11. *Paſchaſius de Cœna Dom.* with many more; but it's needleſs, as we ſhall ſhew by and by, *Lyra* in *Proverb.* 1. 9. and *Carthuſianus* grant it.

Art. 8. Concerning Communion in one kind. *Evangeliſtæ ita tradiderunt præcepiſſe ſibi Jeſum*, Apol. 2. *prope finem.* Epiſt. 54. 56, 63. lib. *de Lapſis. Cypr. de cœna Domini. Dionyſius Carthuſian.* in 1 Cor. 11.

I come to my third Aſſertion. That ſome of the Articles before-mentioned in Pope *Pius*'s Creed, and declared by him to be parts of the Primitive Catholick and Apoſtolick Faith, neceſſary to be believed by all Chriſtians to ſalvation, cannot be proved to be ſuch by the Teſtimonies of any eminent Writers for above one thouſand years after Chriſt. I inſtance, Firſt, In the Article concerning their ſeven Sacraments. No antient Writer for one thouſand years after Chriſt ever taught that there were ſeven Sacraments, *nec plura, nec pauciora*, neither more nor leſs, and that extreme Unction, Matrimony with the reſt, were they. *Peter Lombard*, who lived *An.* 1160. firſt taught this Doctrine, which he could not prove, although he endeavoureth it in other Points, by the Teſtimonies of the antient Fathers. But of this more below.

Aſſert. 3. Several Articles of the Romiſh Faith are not 600 years old. It was firſt made an Article of Faith by the Council of *Florence.* 1439. *V. Caſſand. Conſul.* Art. 13. *Chemnit. in Examen. Perkins Demonſtr. Problem. Licet Primitiva Eccleſia*, &c.

Secondly, In the Article concerning Communion in one kind. The Councils of *Conſtance* and *Trent* confeſs, that the Primitive Church adminiſtred the Euchariſt to the people in both kinds as Chriſt did; yet *non obſtante*, as if this were

Concil. Baſil. Licet ab Initio Chriſtianæ Religionis, &c. *Trent* Council, Can. 1. Seſſ. 5.

little

little to be regarded, they decree the Laity ſhall not receive both, yea, anathematize ſuch as ſay, it is neceſſary from the Inſtitution, practice and command of our Saviour, *Do this*, &c. *Drink ye all of this.* The ſame is acknowledged by *Bellarmine*, *Valentia*, *Coſterus*, and others of their moſt eminent Writers. *Caſſander* confeſſeth, that the Primitive Church, at leaſt in all her publick Adminiſtrations, gave both Elements to the people for one thouſand years after Chriſt. The preſent *Roman* Cuſtom in *Aquinas* his days was but *in quibuſdam Eccleſiis*, in ſome Churches only.

Conſil't. Art. 13.

Part 3. qu. 80. Art. 12.

Thirdly, Tranſubſtantiation, as *Scotus* and *Biel* in *Can. Sect.* 4. acknowledge, was firſt made an Article of Faith by Pope *Innocent* in the *Lateran* Council, not much above four hundred years ago.

V. Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 3. c. 23. *Alph. de Caſtro. De Tranſubſt. rara apud antiquos mentio*, p. 572. c. 8.

Fourthly, Worſhipping of Images with *Latria* came in, as *Camarinus* granteth, one thouſand years after Chriſt. The ſecond *Nicene* Council condemns it.

Opuſc. de Imagin.

Fifthly, The belief of Purgatory and uſe of Indulgences were, *ſerò recepti in Eccleſia*, lately received by the Church, as we have ſeen *Roffenſis* and *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, two zealous Papiſts affirming: It's notorious that Purgatory was firſt made an Article of Faith in the late Council of *Florence* about three hundred years ago, which the *Greek* Church owneth not at this day, nor ever did. Who can now but wonder at the confidence of our Adverſaries, who boaſt of their Antient Catholick and Apoſtolick Religion, accuſing Proteſtants of Novelty and Hereſie, ſetting up a new Faith and Church, becauſe we proteſt againſt and reject theſe erroneous Novelties they would impoſe upon us, and all Chriſtians, as Catholick Truths neceſſary to be believed to Salvation?

V. Caranzam in Concil. Nicæno 2. Art. 2. *Alph. de Caſtro*, lib. 8. p. 572. *V. Conceſſ. fidei Cyrilli, Patriarchæ Conſtant.* Dr. *Field* againſt *Higgons.*

Aſſert. 4. Several Articles of the *Roman* Faith, condemned by eminent Writers

But I haſten to my fourth and laſt Aſſertion, which was this; That there is ſcarcely any point in Controverſie betwixt us and the Papiſts, eſpecially of them before-mentioned, made by Pope *Pius*, and the late *Tridentine* Council, Articles of Faith, but we are able to produce many eminent Writers, and ſome of their own Church, who condemn them

them as well as we in the Ages next before *Luther* appeared in the World. So that what Doctrines and practices the Reformed Proteſtant Churches rejected and condemned, were not the generally received, and unanimouſly avowed Opinions and obſervances of the *Roman*, much leſs Catholick Church, but onely of a powerful and predominant Party in it.

before *Luther*, and by ſome of their own Communion ſince.

I will firſt begin with their Doctrine of ſeven Sacraments. The *Canoniſts*, as *Panormitan* and the *Gloſſe* on *Diſt.* 5. *de Pœnitentia*, ſay, That Penance was not ordained (as the *Trent* Council grants all true Sacraments are) a Sacrament by Chriſt, but is an Inſtitution of the Church onely. *Canus* affirmeth, it's uncertain whether it giveth Grace or no. *Durandus* holds, 4. *Diſt.* 26. *qu.* 3. That Matrimony is no Sacrament univocally and properly ſo called, conferring Grace.

The Number of Sacraments.

V. Rhenanum Annotat. in Tertul. de Pœnitent. Loc. Commun. lib. 8. c. 4. & 5. In qu. Gent. Diſt. 26. qu. 3.

Hugo de S. Victore denieth, that extreme Unction is a Sacrament. *Holcot* quoted by *Caſſander*, *Conſult. art.* 13. ſaith, Confirmation is no Sacrament. *Beſſarion* the Cardinal owneth onely two Sacraments, Baptiſm and the Euchariſt. *Alexander Halenſis* is of opinion, that there are onely four Sacraments of the Goſpel. See Dr. *Field of the Church*, In Append. *p.* 332. and Biſhop *Mortons Appeal*, p. 337. The *Waldenſes* held but two Sacraments, Baptiſm and the Lords Supper, as Proteſtants do.

De Sacram. Euchar. Part. 4. qu. 5. Mem. 2. *Naucler.* Vol. 2.

2. Tranſubſtantiation.

Secondly, As for their new Article of Tranſubſtantiation, *Petrus de Alliaco* a Cardinal ingenuouſly acknowledgeth, that the Opinion which ſuppoſeth the ſubſtance of Bread to remain ſtill after Conſecration (which was *Luther's* Opinion) is poſſible; neither is it contrary to reaſon or Scripture: Nay, ſaith he, it is eaſier to conceive and more reaſonable than that which holdeth, that the ſubſtance doth leave the accidents, and of this Opinion no inconvenience doth ſeem to enſue, if it could be accorded with the Churches (*i. e.* his *Roman* Churches) determination. *Scotus* quoted by *Bellarmine*, ſaith, that before the *Lateran* Council it was no point of Faith. To be ſure, *P. Lombard* the Father of the Schoolmen believed it not. For, he ſaith, if it be demanded, what manner of converſion of the Elements into Chriſts body and bloud, is made by Conſecration, whether formal or ſubſtantial,

Diſt. 11. qu. 6. Art. 2. *add Cameracenſis* 4. *Gent.* qu. 6. Art. 2. *Occam* in 4. *Gent.* 2. 5. *De Euchar.* lib. 3. c. 23. quæſt. 3. Lib. 4. Diſt. 11. qu. 23. Art. 1.

De Verit. Corp. & Sang. D. in Euchar. p. 46. substantial, I am not able to define. *Tunstal* Bishop of *Durham* in Queen *Maries* days declares, that before the Council of *Lateran* no man was bound to believe Transubstantiation, it being free for all men till that time to follow their own conjecture, as to the manner of Christs presence in the Sacrament. Hence he only required the Confession of a Real presence (which we grant) and no more. Yea, he used to say, That if he had been at Pope *Innocent*'s Elbow when he decreed Transubstantiation as an Article of Faith, he could, he thought, have offered him such reasons as should have dissuaded him from it. *Biel* affirmeth, that Transubstantiation is a very new Opinion and lately brought into the Church; and was believed onely or principally on the Authority of Pope *Innocent*, and the Infallibility of the Church (you must suppose *Roman*) which expounds the Scripture by the same Spirit which delivered the Faith to us.

In Can. Miss. Lect. 41.

4 Dist. 11. qu. 1. Num. 9. To which *Durand* agreeth: It is rashness, saith he, to think the body of Christ by his divine Power cannot be in the Sacrament, unless the bread be converted into it. He adds, that the Opinion of Transubstantiation (held by *Lutherans*) is liable to fewer difficulties, but it must not be holden, since the Church (of *Rome*) hath determined the contrary, which is presumed not to err in such matters. Ye see how doubtfully he speaketh of their Churches Infallibility, on whose Authority onely he owneth Transubstantiation, not at all from any cogent authority of Reason or Scripture, which he saith, cannot be found. In like manner *Cameracensis* professeth, he saw not how Transubstantiation could be proved evidently either out of Scripture, or any determination of the Universal or Catholick Church, making it a matter of Opinion, not Faith, and inclining rather as *Alliaco*, to Consubstantiation. *Aquinas* himself acknowledgeth, that some Catholicks *quidam Catholici* thought, that one body could not possibly be present in two places locally, but sacramentally only, which overthroweth Transubstantiation: *Ferus* is very moderate in this point. Seeing, saith he, it's certain that Christs body is in the Sacrament, what need we dispute whether the substance of bread remain or not? Cardinal *Cajetan* himself, quoted by *Suarez*, confesseth,

V. Bell. de Euchar. lib. 3. c. 23.

In 4 Sent. qu. 6.

Scotus in 4. Dist. 11. qu. 3.

Tom. 3. Disp. 46. c. 3.

confeſſeth, that thoſe words ſo urged by *Romaniſts* in this Point, *This is my Body*, ſecluding the Authority of the Church, are not ſufficient to confirm Tranſubſtantiation. Of the ſame Opinion was *Scotus*. The ſame *Cajetan* noteth, that many in truth deny what the word *Tranſubſtantiation* indeed importeth. So if I be not much miſtaken, doth Cardinal *Bellarmine*, who inſtead of a ſubſtantial change or converſion of the Bread into Chriſts Body, maintains onely a Tranſlocation, adduction or ſucceſſion of Chriſts Body into the room and place of it; which (as eaſie to diſcern) is no Tranſubſtantiation of the bread into Chriſts Body, properly ſo called. *Johannes Scotus Erigena* about the year 800. wrote againſt Tranſubſtantiation, proving out of the Scriptures and antient Fathers, that the Bread and Wine are not properly, but figuratively and ſacramentally Chriſts body and bloud. This Book is ſtill extant, and (no wonder) condemned by the Infallible *Index Expurgatorius*.

Supra in Part. 3. ſumm. qu. 75. art. 14.

Ælfricus Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury ſet out, *Anno* 996. in the *Saxon* Tongue his Homilies: wherein he affirms, that the bread is not Chriſts Body *corporaliter, corporally*, but *ſpiritually, ſpiritualiter*. With which perfectly agreeth the Paſchal *Saxon* Homily of *Ælfrick* Abbot of *Malmsbury*, appointed publickly to be read to the People in *England* on *Eaſter* day before the Communion, ſtill extant in Manuſcript in the publick Library of the Univerſity of *Oxford*, and the private Library of *Bennet* College in *Cambridge*; *To which place I gratefully acknowledge I owe the foundation of that ſmall knowledge I have in Divinity.* To theſe may be added, *Bertram de corpore & ſanguine Domini* to *Charles* the Great, who about ſeven hundred years ago *in a juſt Treatiſe* impugneth the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; to whom you may add *Fulbertus, Carnoten, Berengarius, Hincmarus in vita Remigii, Rabanus Maurus.*

Panis ille eſt corpus Chriſti, figurate, &c. *Fulber.* Epiſt. *ad Adeodatum.* Epiſt. *ad Heribaldum.*

3. Purgatory.

As for Purgatory and its Appendix, Indulgences, whoſe moſt groſs abuſe defended by the Pope, firſt opened *Luther*'s mouth againſt him, much need not be ſaid; in regard, as we have ſeen above. *Roffenſis* the Popes Martyr, and *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, to whom I may now add *Polydore Virgil*, confeſs, they are late Novelties, of which in the antient *Greek* Fathers there is little or no mention. The modern *Greek* Church, as appeareth

peareth from their Confeſſion offer'd to the Council of *Baſil*, and ſince that of *Cyril* late Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, denieth any Purgation of ſins after death by Fire. *Lumbard* and *Gratian* take no notice of Indulgences. The later Schoolmen, *Albertus*, *Al. Halenſis*, *Durand*, *Cajetan*, quoted by Biſhop *Uſher* and Dr. *Field* in his Appendix, ſay, that *Finalis Gratia*, &c. final Grace aboliſheth all remains of ſin in Gods Children: what need then of any Purgatorian fire? *Antoninus* acknowledgeth, that concerning Indulgences, *nihil habemus expreſsè*, &c. We have nothing expreſſly or clearly delivered, either in Scripture or the antient Fathers. This ſame is affirmed by *Cajetan* and *Durand*. *Agrippa de Vanitate Scient.* cap. 61. ſaith, that Pope *Boniface* VIII. firſt extended Indulgences to Purgatory, they were oppoſed before *Luther*, by the Univerſity of *Paris*, *Weſſelus*, *Wickliffe*, *Hus*, *Jerome* of *Prague*, *Savanorola*, yea the States of *Germany* complain to the Pope of them as intolerable burdens, cheats and incentives to all manner of wickedneſs. Add *Platina* in *Boniface* 9. *Urſpergenſis*, *Chron.* p. 322.

Anſwer to the Challenge, p. 179.

Part. *prima ſummæ*. Tit. 10. c. 3.

Opuſc. 15. c. 1. *De Indulg.* lib. 4. diſt. 20. qu. 3.

Primus in Purgatorium extendit Indulgentias.

V. Chemnit. Exam. de Indulg. 742. & 100 *Gravamina.*

Art. 4. Image-worſhip.

Worſhipping of Image was, as is notorious, firſt Decreed (though not with *Latria*) in the ſecond *Nicene* Council about the year 794. but was oppoſed and condemned by the General Councils of *Conſtantinople* and *Frankfort*, in which laſt were three hundred Biſhops, called by the Emperour and Pope whoſe Legates were there preſent, as the Biſhop of *Rhemes* reports, *apud Alanum Copum*, *Dial.* 4. and *Suarez* grants it, in 3. *Part. Thomæ qu.* 25. *diſp.* 54. This worſhip of Images was confuted alſo by *Albinus* or *Alcuinus* out of the Scriptures, as *Hoveden* relates *in continuat. Bedæ ad ann.* 794. Moreover, by the Book of *Charles* the Great (if it be not the ſame with the former,) which is ſtill extant in the *Vatican*, and acknowledged to be genuine by ſome learned Papiſts. *Agobardus* Biſhop of *Lyons* wrote againſt worſhipping Pictures or Images. So did alſo *Jonas* Biſhop of Or-

V. Polyd. Virgil. de Invent. rerum, lib. 6.

V. Caſſand. infra.

See *Uſpergenſis* & *Rhegino ad* Ann. 794. and *Matth. Weſtminſt. ad* Ann. 794.

Caſſand. Conſult. art. *de Imagin.*

The work of Mens Hands may not be adored, no not in honour of their Prototypes, *p.* 213, *De Trad.* Part 3. *De Imagin.*

leans

leans in his Book *de Cultu Imaginum*, allowing them onely for Ornament in Churches, but deteſts the giving them any part of divine Honour, as accurſed wickedneſs. *Pereſius* ſaith as much. *Gerſon de defect. virer. Eccleſ. Holcot de Sapientia Lect.* 158. *Miraudula*, Apol. qu. 3. condemn bowing before them: *Durand. de ritib. Eccl. Catharinus de cult. Imagin.* grant, that their uſe is dangerous in regard of the peril of Idolatry. See our Churches Homily on the Peril of Idolatry. *Polydore Virgil* ſaith, all the Fathers condemn'd worſhipping Images. *Bellarmine* himſelf granteth, that the worſhip of Images (as defended and practiſed by the *Roman* Church, *i.e.* with *Latria* or the ſame worſhip we give to the Prototypes) cannot be maintained without ſuch nice diſtinctions of abſolutely and relatively, or accidentally, univocally or analogically, properly or improperly, as ſcarce themſelves, much leſs the weak common people can underſtand, or if they do, can hardly avoid Error in practiſing them; *Pereſius* more plainly: They are a ſcandal to the weak who cannot underſtand them, but by erring. Hence the Cardinal accounteth it not ſafe to teach their Votaries publickly to give Divine Honour or *Latria* to the Image of Chriſt for his ſake. Nevertheleſs it's undeniable that this is the profeſſed Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, declared by their Oracle *Aquinas*, and *conſtans opinio*, as *Azorius* ſpeaks, the conſtant Opinion of their Divines, defended by *Valentia*, *Suarez*, and that as the ſenſe of the Council of *Trent*. *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit to defend this Adoration bluſhed not to write, that it is lawful to worſhip the Sun, yea (God bleſs us) the Devil himſelf, ſo the worſhip be directed ultimately to God and his Honour; whereas it's notorious, that the Heathens might and *did* in this very manner defend their groſs Idolatry. The very making of the Images of the Trinity is condemn'd by *Abulenſis*, *Durand*, *Pereſius* and others, yet defended and practiſed by the *Roman* Church. *Walafridus Strabo* called it *Superſtition* and blockiſhneſs, *hebitudinem*, to worſhip Images. I will end, that I be not too tedious, with the words of *Jonas* Biſhop of *Orleans*, as

cap. 5.

De Invent. rerum. lib. 6. c. 13.

De Imag. l. 2. c. 22.

De Trad. p. 226.

V. Biel. in Canon. *Miſſæ* Sect. 49.

Part 3. qu. 28. Art. 3.

Inſtit. Mor. Tom. 1. l. 9.

Suarez. Tom. 1. Diſp. 54. Sect. 4.

Vaſq. in qu. 25. diſp. 110. c. 2.

See *Orig.* in *Celſ.* l. 6. & 8. *Arnob.* lib. 6. *Apud Bellar. de Imag.* l. 2. c. 8.

V. Aug. de fide & ſymb. cap. 7. *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. 5. pag. 609. *Concil. Trident.* Compare *Origen*, Lib. 7. in *Celſum.*

an Anſwer to our Adverſaries Reply, That they place no Divinity in their Images, but worſhip them onely in honour of God and of him whoſe Image it is, ſeeing they know there is no Divinity in Images, they are the more to be condemned for giving to an infirm and beggerly Image the honour that is due to the Divinity. I cannot omit what I find in *Agobardus*, it being ſo conſonant with *Jonas* as making one ſentence. They which anſwer (as our *Roman* Catholicks now do) they think no Divinity to be in the Image they worſhip, but that they worſhip it in honour of him whoſe image it is, are eaſily anſwered, becauſe if the Image they worſhip be not God, neither is it to be worſhipped in honour of the Saints, who uſe not to arrogate to themſelves Divine Honour. He adds, That the Images of Chriſt and the Apoſtles were expreſſed by the Antients after the cuſtom of the *Gentiles*, rather for love and memory than for any religious honour or worſhip. He concludes; This is the ſincere Religion, this is the Catholick Cuſtome, this is the Tradition of the Fathers, *&c.* The *Greeks* condemn giving *Latria* or *Douleia* to Images in their confeſſion of Faith. *The Popes Supremacy* over Emperours, Councils, Biſhops, *&c.* This was contradicted by the Council of *Baſil* (confirmed by Pope *Nicolas*) who decreed, that it was *de fide* a point of Faith, that the Pope ought to be ſubject to a General Council. Of the ſame opinion were the Councils of *Piſa* and *Conſtance*, who depoſed ſeveral Popes as Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, for refuſing to appear upon their Summons. *Balſamon* a *Greek* Writer ſheweth, that the five Patriarchs were equal in honour and power, and were all inſtead of one Head over the whole Church. *Cuſanus* the Cardinal confeſſeth, that the eight firſt General Councils were all called by the Emperours, and that the Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon* concerning the precedency of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* before him of *Alexandria* (notwithſtanding Pope *Leo*'s diſclaiming it) was in full force and Authority. *Sigebert* termeth the Popes abſolving Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance to their Princes, Novelty and Hereſie. *Otho* the Emperour depoſed Pope *John*, and aſſumed his antient right of Nomination to the Popedom. The Popes uſurped Authority

De Pict. & Imag. p. 237.

V. Euſeb. ſupra.

p. 251. In *Confeſſ. fidei per Critopulum Patriarch.* 5.

Ann. 1430. Seſſ. 4. *Veritas fidei Catholicæ. Caranza,*

An. 1409.

An. 1414. *Reſponſ. de Privileg. Patriarch.*

Concord. l. 2. c. 25.

Supra, cap. 20. p. 748.

Card. Cuſanus Concord. l. 2. c. 20.

Ad An. 1088. *Sigonius de Regno Ital. l.* 7.

Authority over the Emperour, was wrote againſt by *Merſilius, Occam, Gerſon, Dantes, Zabarella, Cuſanus, Toſtatus, Alliaco, Antoninus* and many others. *Apud Bellarmin. de Concil.* l. 1. c. 140.

The Sacrifice of Chriſt in the Maſs was unknown to Pope *Lumbard*, who ſaith, The Sacrament is called *a Sacrifice*, becauſe it is the Memorial and repreſentation of the true Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs. *Aquinas* expreſſeth his ſenſe after the ſame manner. The Celebration of this Sacrament is an image and repreſentation of the paſſion of Chriſt, *quæ eſt vera immolatio*, which is a true Immolation or Sacrifice; and now its celebration *dicitur*, is called, the Immolation, *immolatio*, of Chriſt. Of the ſame judgement were *Biel* and *Cornelius Muſs*, a Biſhop of note in the Council of *Trent*, who (as *Canus* and *Sixtus Senenſis* relate) openly denied, that Chriſt inſtituted any proper Sacrifice of himſelf when he celebrated his Supper. *Janſenius* acknowledgeth it can hardly be proved from *Hoc facite, Do this*, &c. Inſtead of many more who might be added, take the words of the Popes own Canon-Law, ſet out by *Gregory* XIII. The ſacramental Bread, *ſuo modo vocatur, after its manner* is called *the Body of Chriſt*, when *revera* indeed, it is the Sacrament of Chriſts Body, and the immolation of his Fleſh made by the Prieſt, is termed his Paſſion, death and crucifixion, *non rei veritate, ſed ſignificante myſterio, not in the truth of the thing, but in a ſignificant myſtery.* The Gloſs upon it is ſtill more plain. The Sacrament, in regard it truly repreſenteth Chriſts Fleſh, *dicitur Chriſti corpus, ſed impropriè*, is called *Chriſt's Body, but improperly.* It is called Chriſts Body, that is, ſaith the Gloſs, *ſignificat*, it *ſignifies it.*

In Sent. lib. 4. diſt. 12. art. 5. Part 3. qu. 83. Art. 1.

In Can. Miſſæ Lect. 85. *Loc. Theol.* l. 12. c. 12. p. 660. *Biblioth.* l. 4. Concord. c. 131.

Decret. part. 3. *de* Conſecrat. diſt. 2. c. 48. *Gloſſa in Grat. de Conſecr.* See Canon of the Maſs, and Dr. *Field* in Append.

Communion in one kind. The *Ordo Romanus*, appointed the Wine allo to be conſecrated, that the people might fully communicate, ſaith *Micrologus. Ovandus* declares, as alſo *Caſſander*, that it were better to grant the Cup to the people, which was earneſtly deſired by the Emperours *Ferdinand* and *Maximilian*, and under ſome good conditions permitted to the *Bohemians. Halenſis* a famous Schoolman granteth, (contrary to *Bellarmine*) that it ought to be received under both kinds, Which manner of receiving, ſaith he, *Dominus tradidit*, our

7.

De Obſerv. Eccleſ. c. 19. In 4. Diſt. 9. Prop. 6. Conſult. Art. 22. In 4. Sent. qu. 11. Mem. 3. *V. Tapperum apud Caſſandr. de Commun. ſub utraque ſpecie*, Ibid. qu. 31.

Lord

Lord delivered, is *majoris efficaciæ*, *of more efficacy and perfection*, (as to Grace) than to receive one onely. *Eccius*, *Salmeron*, *Lindanus*, *Valentia*, *Coſterus*, *Bellarmine*, *Card. Bona*, confeſs, that the Primitive Chriſtians for many Ages, yea, ſay ſome, for above one thouſand years after Chriſt, received the Sacrament in both kinds. The cuſtome of receiving in one kind, had its firſt Original from the *Manichean* Hereticks, as we learn from Pope *Leo* the Great. *P. Gelaſius* decrees, That if they would not receive both, they ſhould be excluded from both. *Stephen Gardiner* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, in his Book called *the Devil's Sophiſtry*, aſcribes its firſt beginning to the private ſuperſtitious Devotion of ſome indiſcreet perſons. Others, as *Coſterus* in *Enchir.* to the connivance or negligence of Church-Governours. In the Maſs-book it ſelf, there are (as Dr. *Field* obſerves) ſome expreſſions which imply, that the people were receivers of both kinds: as particularly thoſe words, *Cibo potuque refecti*, being refreſhed with *meat and drink*, in a Prayer after the receiving the Communion. Again, *Sacramenta quæ ſumpſimus*, *Domini*, *proſint nobis*, &c. *Let the Sacraments*, *Lord*, *we have received*, *be profitable to us.* To theſe add thoſe words: *Quotquot ſacroſanctum corpus & ſanguinem Filii tui ſumpſerimus*, quoted by *Caſſander*; *As many of us as have received the body and bloud of thy Son.* *Gerardus Lorichius*, and *Ruardus Tapperus*, are for the peoples receiving in both kinds. See Dr. *Field*'s Appendix to his ſecond Book, where are many clear Teſtimonies.

Totus Chriſtus non continetur ſub utraque ſpecie, 4. qu. 40.

Aquin. in 6. *Joann.*

Alph. de Caſtro adv. Hæreſ. lib. 6.

Serm. *de Quadrageſ.* quoted by B. *Juel.*

In Append. in lib. 3.

In Miſſ. de Sanct.

V. Conſult. p. 238. Art. 24.

8. I had almoſt forgot *Invocation of Saints*. *Bannes*, a late learned Schoolman agreeth with Proteſtants, that it hath no expreſs grounds in Scripture. In like manner *Eccius* in *Enchirid.* c. 15. *De Venerat.* SS. *Suarez in* 3. *Thomæ qu.* 3. *diſput.* 42. *Salmeron* in 1 Tim. cap. 2. *diſp.* 8. *Bellarmine* himſelf, although to make a ſhew he alledg places out of the old Teſtament, granteth, that there was no *Invocation of Saints* before Chriſts Aſcenſion, in regard the Saints were then in Limbo, and not admitted to the ſight of God. The ſame is affirmed of the Saints under the New Teſtament by many of the moſt antient Fathers, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Chryſoſtome*, to wit, that they ſhall not be admitted to the Viſion beatifical till after the Reſurrection; *Occam. Scotus*, lib. 4. diſt.

22. qu. 1. Art. 10. *Concluſ.* 2.

Lib. 1. *de Eccleſ. trium*, c. 6.

V. Sixtum Senenſ. lib. 6. Annotat. 345.

In 4. Sent. qu. 3.

diſt. 45. qu. 4. *Valentia* with others deny, that the Saints departed, or Angels, ſee all things in *Speculo Trinitatis*, in God who ſeeth all things, but onely ſuch as are eſſential to their happineſs, and which he is pleaſed to repreſent to them. *Claudius Eſpencæus* teſtifieth, that ſome old Folk truſted in the Saints, and aſcribed no leſs to them than to God himſelf, and thought it eaſier to intreat or prevail with one of them for obtaining their requeſts and deſires than him. *Ludovicus Vives* profeſſeth he could diſcern no difference betwixt the worſhip of Saints practiſed in his time and the heatheniſh *Parentalia*. *Wickliffe*, *apud Walden.* Tom. 3. Tit. 12. the *Albigenſes* and *Waldenſes* rejected long before *Luther Invocation of Saints*. I ſhall cloſe this Particular with the words of *Caſſander* a learned and ingenuous Papiſt; —— This falſe and pernicious Opinion is too well known to have prevailed among the Vulgar, while wicked men perſevering in their naughtineſs, are perſuaded that onely by the interceſſion of the Saints, whom they have choſen to be their Patrons and worſhip with cold and prophane Ceremonies, they have Pardon and Grace prepared them with God: which pernicious Opinion hath been confirmed in them with lying Miracles. And there is another Errour, that men not evil of themſelves, have choſen certain Saints to be their Patrons and keepers, and put confidence in their Merits and Interceſſion more than in the Merits of Chriſt; ſo far, that the onely Office of Chriſts Interceſſion being obſcured, they ſubſtituted into his place the Saints, and ſpecially the Virgin his Mother, *&c.* Are not theſe things highly injurious to the honour of our bleſſed Saviour and Redeemer? Did they not call aloud for an effectual Reformation?

Videt omnia qui videt videntem omnia, Greg. M. In 2. Tom. 3. digreſ. 17. p. 118.

In Auguſt. de Civil. Dei, l. 8. c. 27.

Conf. p. 154.

Compare Sir *Edwin. Sandys's Europæ Speculum*, pag. 56.

Biel in Can. Miſſæ, Lect. 30. ſaith as much.

Solus Deus ſimpliciter orandus eſt. Sancti magis ſe tenent ex parte orantium, quam illius qui oratur Halenſ. qu. 92. Mem. 10. Art. 4.

I might add ſeveral other Points of Doctrine, which, if they be not already by the *Tridentine* Decrees, may become Articles of Faith whenſoever the Pope pleaſeth.

The

To deny it, *is ſententia Hæreſi proxima, non proprie hæretica.* *De Infallib. Papæ*, l. 4. c. 1. *V. Caranzam.* Seſſ. 12. 38. 35. *V. Alphonſ. de Caſtro adv. Hæreſ.* l. 1. c. 2. vid. cap. 4. Ibid. *Stapleton Contr.* 3. qu. 4. ſaith, it's no Point of Faith, but of Opinion only. *Cuſan. Concord.* l. 1. c. 14. *Canus* loc. Com. l. 6. c. *ult.* *Cajetan. de Authorit. Papæ* c. 26. Lib. 1. c. 4. *Valent.* Lib. 8. *Analyſ. fidei*, cap. 1. Pope *Hadrian* in 4. *de Sacram. Confirmat. ſub finem.* *Canus* Loc. l. 6. c. *ult.* p. 331.

The *Popes Infallibility*, the Ground, Rock and foundation of all their Faith and Religion, is *ferè*, *almoſt*, ſaith *Bellarmin*, an Article of Faith, and but almoſt, which all prudent and conſidering men may well wonder at. Yet it is not only denied by the Council of *Baſil*, who decree that it is *de fide*, a Point of Faith, that the Pope ought to be ſubject to a General Council, (in regard he may be, as *Liberius*, *Zepherinus*, *Honorius*, *Anaſtaſius* and ſome other Popes were, a notorious Heretick and Schiſmatick) but ſtrongly confuted by *Occam* qu. 1. *de poteſtate Pontif.* c. 9. *Almain Quæſt. in Veſp. de Autoritate Eccl.* c. 10. *Ovandus* 4. Diſt. 18. prop. 25. *Coroll.* 2. *Nicolas Clemangis de corrupto Eccleſ. ſtatu.* *Alvarus Pelagius de planctu Eccl. Contarenus Gerſon*, &c. *Lyra in Matth.* 16. *Turrecremata Summ. Eccl.* l. 4. part 2. c. 16. 20. with many more, grant the Pope may be a Heretick in his private perſon or judgment; yea, as *Alphonſ. de Caſtro*, *Bozius*, *Tom.* 2. *de ſign. Eccleſ.* l. 18. c. *ult.* *Bannes* 22. qu. 1. Art. 10. acknowledge that he may be, not onely a Heretick himſelf, but impoſe by his Pontifical Authority in his Decrees Hereſie on the whole Church. The truth is, there is need of an infallible Judge to determine where, or in whom the *Roman* Infallibility reſides. Some of them ſay, in the Pope alone; whether he maturely conſiders what he decrees, or no. Whether the Premiſſes on which he builds his concluſion be pertinent or not, true or falſe. Some in the Pope, aſſiſted with a General or Provincial Council. Some in a General Council without, yea, decreeing againſt the Pope. Some in the Univerſal Tradition of the Church. They have little reaſon then to upbraid Proteſtants with their difference of Opinion in leſſer matters, ſeeing they differ amongſt themſelves in the fundamental Article and ground of all their Religion.

Valentia Analyſ. fidei, lib. 8. c. 3. & 4. *V. Bellar. de Pontif.* *M. Waldenſis Doctrin. fidei*, l. 2. c. 19. Add *Alph. de Caſtro*, lib. 1. cap. 4.

2. *The Immaculate Conception of the bleſſed Virgin Mary.* This is almoſt an Article of Faith amongſt them; inſomuch that no Divine can commence Doctor (as *Salmeron* reports)

reports) in the Univerſity of *Paris*, unleſs he ſwear to maintain it. Nevertheleſs, it is not onely contradicted by the Antient Fathers generally, but by the Elder School men, as *Bannes*, Part 1. in Tho. qu. art. 8. dub. 5. and *Turrecremata de Conſecrat.* diſt. 4. num. 11. *acknowledge. Lumbard* lib. 3. Sent. diſt 3. *Aquinas ſumm.* 3. part. qu. 27. art. 2. *Cajetan opuſc.* Tom. 2. Tract. 1. *de conceptione Virg. Bonaventure*, Diſt. 3. in Sent. 3. qu. 1. Art. 1. *Capreolus*, l. 3. diſt. 3. to whom many more may be added, affirm the ſame.

Orig. Hom. 17. *in Lucam. Chryſoſt.* Hom. 45. & 46. *in Matthæum. Auguſt. Quæſt. vet. & novi Teſt.* qu. 73. *Theophylact. in* 2. *Lucæ &* Matth. 12.

3. That the Apocryphal Books are to be received as of equal Authority with the Canonical, is decreed and ſo made a point of Faith by the Council of *Trent*; yet it is evidently contradicted, not onely by the *Laodicean* Council, *Ruffinus*, *Origen*, *Hierom*, *P. Gregory* the Great and others; but by multitudes of their own modern Writers, as *Cajetan*, *Lyra*, *Hugo*, *Sigonius*, *Occam*, the ordinary Gloſs, *Waldenſis*, *Antoninus*, *Toſtatus*, *Carthuſianus*, *Faber*, *Clichtoveus*, *Driedo*, *Ferus*, with many more. *Canus*, even ſince the Council of *Trents* Decree, ſaith, It's no Hereſie to reject the Book of *Baruc*, and *Sixtus Senenſis* ſince that Council, denies the additions to the Book of *Heſter* to be Canonical.

Auguſt. in. cont. Gaudentium, l. 2 c. 23. See *Field's* Appendix to his third Book of the Church. Loc. lib. 2. c. 9. *Biblioth.* lib. 1. c. 19.

4. That we are juſtified by our own good Works, or inherent Righteouſneſs, and not by Faith onely, is decreed by the *Trent* Council as an Article of Catholick Faith; yet it is plainly contradicted, not onely by the Antient Fathers, *Clem.* Rom. Epiſt. ad *Corinth. Juſtin Martyr* ad *Diognet. Origen* in cap. 3. ad Rom. *Ambroſe* in Rom. c. 4. & 9. *Baſil de Humil. Theodoret de curand. Græc. affect.* lib. 7. *Chryſoſtome* in Galat. *c.* 3. *Heſychius* in Levit. l. 4. c. 3. with others; but by *Aquinas* in Galat. 3. lect. 4. in Rom. 3. lect. 4. *Pighius de juſtific.* Cardinal *Contarenus.* The *Anti-didag. Colonienſ. Anſelm, apud Hoſium.* Tom: 1. *Confeſſ. Cathol. Bonaventure* 4. diſt. 15. qu. 1. *Janſenius* Concordant. c. 20. p. 157. *Gerſon*, lib. 4. de Conſolat. Theolog. proſa 1.

5. That good Works merit Eternal life, is in like manner decreed by the Council of *Trent*. But *Waldenſis* Sacramental. Tit. 1. c. 7. ſaith, He is the better Catholick that ſimply denieth all Merit, and confeſſeth that Heaven is obtained by Grace onely. The like is affirmed by *Ferus*, lib. 3. Com. cap. 20. *in Matthæum. Stella* in *Lucam.* c. 8. *Marſilius de*

Ibid. c. 15.

P. *Adrian* and *Clitoveus apud Cassand. Consult.* Art. 6.

De Justif. lib. c. 7.

gratuitâ justif. Faber Stapulensis in cap. 11. ad Roman. *Petavius* the Jesuit, in effect denieth all Merits, which he saith, *Dissert. Eccl.* lib. 2. c. 4. depend on Gods Grace and free Promise. *Bellarmine* after his long dispute about Justification by Works and Salvation by Merits, confutes all he had said in these few words, *Tutissimum est*, &c. It's the *safest way, propter incertitudinem propriæ justitiæ, in regard of the uncertainty of our own righteousness* (on which the certain knowledge that we have any Merits at all is grounded) *and the danger of pride and vain glory*, periculum inanis gloriæ, *to place our whole trust* totam fiduciam, *in Gods mercy onely*, in solâ misericordia Dei. Can any Protestant say more in opposition to Merits and Justification, by our good own Works? Let our very Enemies be Judges. I might add *Greg. Ariminens.* 1. dist. 17. qu. 1. art. 2. *Durand.* 2. dist. 27. qu. 2. p. 400. *Scotus* lib. 1. c. 17. qu. 1. *in solutione quæst.*

C. *Contarenus* Epist. *ad Card. Farnesium.*

6. *Prayer in a Tongue not understood by the People*, is defended and practised in the *Roman* Church; yet censured and disapproved by Cardinal *Contarenus*. *Cajetan* and *Aquinas*, in 1 *Cor.* 14. confess, it were better for Edification of the people for Prayer and other sacred Offices to be performed in the Vulgar Tongue. Of the same Judgment were *Lyranus*, in 1 *Cor.* 14. *Cassander defensio officii pii viri cont. Calvin.* p. 141. *Haymo* and *Sedulius*, in 1 *Cor.* 14. *Biel in Can. Missæ* Lect. 62.

See *Brerewoods* Enquiries, Ch. 26. *Contaren. Instructio Christ. Rhemist. Annotat.* in 1 Cor. 14.

7. *Auricular Confession*, so severely urged by the *Roman* Church, is denied to be necessary by any Divine Law, by *Peresius* a *Tridentine* Bishop, *de Tradit. part* 3. *consid.* 3.—— *Petrus Oxoniensis apud Caranzam in Sixto.* By *Cajetan, Bonaventure, Rhenanus, Erasmus*, with many others. It were easie, but I suppose needless, to add any Points more. These are sufficient to evince, that besides other Doctrines, some Articles of the present *Roman* Catholick Faith so decreed and made by the late Council of *Trent*, were never Universally owned and received *as such* by the visible Catholick Church in all Ages, no not by all such as lived and died in the Communion of the *Roman* Church not long before *Luther's* time, but were openly opposed, contradicted and condemn'd by them.

What

What is already ſaid is, as I conceive, a full and ſatisfactory Anſwer to *Roman* Catholicks, demanding of us ſome Profeſſors of our Religion before the Reformation: It being ſtrange, if it be from the Apoſtles and have been in all Ages, that we can ſhew no Writings of ſome eminent Profeſſors of it before the Reformation; For here we have produced the Writings of Eminent Profeſſors of it, to wit, of the Prophets, Apoſtles, Holy Fathers, and many of their own modern moſt learned Writers. As to the Writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles, many of their own Writers, *Lindanus*, *Pereſius*, *Soto*, *Andradius*, &c. confeſs, that all or moſt of their new *Trent* Articles of Faith, to wit, Seven Sacraments: Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Indulgences, *&c.* have little or no ground at all in Scripture, but are unwritten Verities depending on Tradition onely, to wit, of their *Roman* Church. We can ſhew what we believe as neceſſary to Salvation from the Scripture; which they, as they confeſs, in many Points cannot. Yea, what ſoever we believe as Articles of Faith contained in the Primitive Creeds, they dare not deny. All our diſpute is about Points either not at all to be found, at leaſt with any convincing evidence, in the Bible; or plainly contradicted by it.

Panopl. lib. 3. c. 5. *De Tradit. Cont. Brent.* l. 2. c. 68. *Orthodox. explic.* l. 2. *Canus* Loc. Tom. l. 3. c. 3.

The Proteſtant Religion then is the true, antient, viſible, Catholick and Apoſtolick Religion profeſſed and taught by the Apoſtles, in and by their Writings; for what they firſt preached, they afterward by the will of God ſet down in their Writings, that ſo in them we might have a ſure foundation to build our Faith upon, as *Irenæus* ſaith. Farther, we have produced alſo the Writings of the Antient Fathers, who lived in the Ages near the Apoſtles, and have made it evident, that they were either wholly ignorant of the new additional Articles of the preſent *Roman* Catholick Faith, or much doubted of them, or utterly condemned them. It's true, theſe Writers were not known by the name of *Proteſtants*, as ſome may object, and no more were they known by the name of *Papiſts*. But if they profeſſed, as to be ſure they did, that Doctrine or Religion onely, which is delivered and declared in their Writings; Who will deny that they were, although not nominally, yet really

Iren. lib. 3. c. 1. *Quod præconiaverunt, poſtea per Dei voluntatem in ſcripturis nobis tradiderunt fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtræ futurum.*

Proteſtants, and Profeſſours of our Antient, not of their new-minted *Roman* Religion, made as to ſome parts of it, to wit, Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, *&c.* and framed in late Councils, near twelve hundred years after the deceaſe of the Apoſtles?

To their uſual Queſtion then, Where was the Proteſtant Church or Religion before *Luther?* I Anſwer, Firſt, That it was there, where their whole Religion cannot, as they grant, be found; to wit, in the Holy Scriptures. Secondly, It was, as Biſhop *Uſher* ſaith well, where their Church was, in the ſame place, though not in the ſame ſtate and condition. The Reformation or Proteſtantiſm did not make a new Faith or Church, but reduced things to the Primitive purity; Plucked not up the good Seed, the Catholick Faith or true Worſhip, but the after-ſown Tares of Errour, as Image-worſhip, Purgatory, *&c.* which were ready tó choak it. Did the Reformation in *Hezekiah*'s or *Joſiah*'s days, ſet up a new Church or Religion different in eſſence from the old one? Had it not been a ridiculous impertinency for one that knew *Naaman* before, whilſt he ſtood by to ask, where is *Naaman?* and being anſwered this is he; for the Enquirer to reply, it cannot be he, for *Naaman* was a Leper, this man is clean: Was not *Naaman* formerly a Leper, and now cleanſed the ſame perſon? A Field of Wheat in part weeded, is the ſame it was as to ground and ſeed, not another. In like manner, the true viſible Chriſtian Church cleanſed and unclean, reformed and unreformed is the ſame Church altered, not as to Eſſence or ſubſtance, but quality or condition.

Dr. *White*, *ſub Papatu, non Papatus.*

That the true Viſible Church of God may be generally over-run with corruptions in Worſhip, Errours, yea Hereſies; we ſee not onely in the Jewiſh but Chriſtian Churches of *Corinth*, *Thyatira*, &c. and all the *Eaſtern* Churches, yea almoſt the whole World in *Athanaſius* his days, is ſo undeniable a truth, that *Baronius* and others of our Adverſaries are forced, as we have ſeen above, to grant it. Why ſhould it then ſeem to them impoſſible or incredible, that the Church of God in the blind and unlearned Ages before *Luther* ſhould in like manner be over-run with many pernicious Errours in Doctrine and corruptions in Worſhip: If ſo, as

Ad ann. 358. *Totus mundus abiit poſt Pelagium.*

Bradwardin de cauſa Dei in præfat.

as *Nicolas Clemangis*, *Alvarus*, *Pelagius* and others of their own Church confeſs and bewail; why might not the King of *England*, as well as *Hezekiah* or *Joſiah*, redreſs theſe Abuſes, and ſuppreſs theſe Errours in his own Dominions? Why might not other States and Princes do the ſame? eſpecially when Reformation of them by a free General Councll, (not enſlaved to the Popes will and pleaſure) though promiſed, could not be obtained. Was it neceſſary for fear of making a new Church or Religion, that the Church of God muſt for ever lie under thoſe defilements and corruptions? If not, may not our Reformers juſtly ſay, What Evil have we done?

V. Caranzam de Conciliis, p. 786, 789.

V. Concil. Piſanum Seſſ. 16. & 20.

Not to be too tedious: This Queſtion, Where was the Proteſtant Church in the Ages before *Luther*, ariſeth from ſeveral miſtakes: Firſt, From want of diſtinguiſhing betwixt a *true* viſible Church and a *ſound* one. The *Roman* Church from which *Luther* and others received their Baptiſm and Ordination, We grant to be a part or member of the Catholick Church, but it was unſound and ſubject to many Diſeaſes, *i. e.* corruptions in Doctrine, Worſhip and Diſcipline, which like ill humours endangered its very life. The Reformation wherein *Luther* with many more were inſtrumental, was not Poiſon to deſtroy its Vitals, but purgative Phyſick to remove its diſtempers, and to preſerve them. Secondly, It's a miſtake, that they will not diſtinguiſh betwixt the avowed and univerſally owned Doctrines of a Church, and the Opinions or practices of ſome few or many in it. In the Churches of *Pergamus* or *Thyatira* there were ſome, and poſſibly not a few, who held the Doctrine of *Balaam*, and were ſeduced by that wicked *Jezabel*, pretending to be a Propheteſs and infallible; yet theſe Doctrines were not properly the Doctrines of thoſe Churches, but of a party in them. The like we ſay of the Errours in the Church of *Rome*, that they were never univerſally owned and allowed, no not by many eminent Profeſſours and Writers of her own Communion, as we have made evident. Thirdly, It's a great miſtake when they demand that we ſhew the Proteſtant Religion and Church diſtinct and ſeparate from the Catholick in all Ages, when we affirm

firm and prove, that not onely in the Apoſtles days, but for near five hundred years after, the true Apoſtolick Faith was, at leaſt as to ſubſtance, kept pure and uncorrupt. Would they have us to ſhew Proteſtants proteſting againſt the antient and Primitive Faith? As for their New *Tridentine* Articles of Faith, they were to be ſure, not ſome of them then in being to be proteſted againſt. Fourthly, It's a groſs miſtake to think, that all who live in a true but corrupted Chriſtian Church, are either bound to approve of thoſe corruptions, or at all times neceſſary to ſeparate actually and perſonally from the Church for their ſake. This Proteſtants condemn in *Donatiſts* and *Browniſts* or Separatiſts. The Errors and corruptions of the *Roman* Church were a long time growing in or upon her. The Tares were not ſeen as ſoon as they were ſown, but after they were grown up. God forbid we ſhould condemn to Hell all our Forefathers, that lived and died in the Communion of the *Roman* Church. In the Prophet *Elijah*'s, *Iſaiah*'s, *Jeremiah*'s days the true Viſible Church of God was corrupted, both Princes, Prieſts and People ſeverely reproved, yet the Prophets adviſed none to ſeparate therefore from the Temple and Worſhip of God, although no doubt their mind was that all, as far as was poſſible, ſhould keep themſelves free and undefiled from thoſe prevalent corruptions. Likewiſe, our Bleſſed Saviour forſook not the Temple; and although he warned them to *take heed of the leaven*, i. e. falſe Doctrines, of the Scribes and Phariſees, yet in regard they ſate in *Moſes* his Chair, he commands the people to do as they ſaid (*i. e.* according to the Law) and conſequently to go and hear what they ſaid. Much, very much, as *Auſtin* and other Fathers tell us, is to be born rather than to make a Schiſm in the Church of God. On this ground no doubt many of our Forefathers before the Reformation continued till death in the Communion of the *Roman* Church, that ſo they might enjoy the benefit of the Word and Sacraments; although they mourned for and groaned under the overflowing predominancy of many Errors and ſuperſtitious Obſervations in their days, heartily deſiring, yea openly requiring a removal of them, but could not obtain it.

See Bull againſt Can.

The

The *Jeſuit* whom Dr. *White* anſwered acknowledgeth, that the Church is not actually ſeen at all times, yet it may be diſcerned with prudent and diligent enquiry, in regard even in times of its greateſt obſcurity or perſecution there were always ſome *Eminent* and *known Members* of it. He adds, although it have not always an outward and illuſtrious Eſtate, and cannot, where perſecution rageth, practiſe publickly the Rites of Divine Worſhip, yet the Church never did or ſhall want an *inward* Eſtate or ſubordination to Paſtors, *&c.* If this be, as he grants, ſufficient to make good the perpetual viſibility of the Church, we can eaſily evince the Viſibility of the Proteſtant Church and Religion under Papal perſecutions from the Writings of thoſe times, as the Reader may in part diſcern from what we have collected. But in regard they ſo vehemently urge us to ſhew ſome Profeſſours of the Proteſtant Religion divided and ſeparated from the *Roman* Church, we (though it be no way neceſſary, as we have ſeen above) mention the *Wickleviſts, Lollards, Bohemians, Waldenſes,* and *Albigenſes,* who were vaſtly numerous and had Paſtors of their own, reſiſting Popery even unto bloud. Onely I muſt mind our Adverſaries, theſe perſons were rather *fugati, violently driven out* of the *Roman* Church by Excommunications armed with Fire and Sword, than *fugitivi, fugitives* or voluntary Separatiſts. As for their condemning them as Hereticks, it ſignifies little or nothing, for that's the matter in queſtion, and ſeeing the Pope and Court of Rome, as Saint *Bernard,* Pope *Adrian, Sarisberienſis* and others acknowledge, were in thoſe days charged as the ſource and original cauſe of all diſorders and abuſes in the Church, it's moſt unreaſonable their known Enemies ſhould be admitted as their Judges in their own cauſe. The truth is, ſome of the Popiſh Writers of thoſe days have accuſed *Wickcliffe,* the *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes* of ſuch inconſiſting, horrid and ſelf-contradicting Opinions, that no ingenuous and impartial man can poſſibly believe any thing they ſay of them. I verily think their great fault or Hereſie was, that they were *victus populus Dei,* as they ſaid, conquered, quelled and ſubdued by force of Arms, not Arguments:

Pag. 379.

See Biſhop *Uſher, de ſucceſſ. Eccl.*

Bernard de Concil. Adri. in legatione ad Principes Germaniæ. Polycrat. lib. 6. cap. 24. Uſher de Succeſſ Eccl.

So

So were the Catholicks under the Heathen and *Arian* perſecuting Emperours. Certainly no prudent Chriſtian will take Proſperity, Victory, outward Pomp and Power to be certain notes or perpetual properties of the true Church and right Believers: nay Adverſity and perſecution rather, as our Saviour intimates, when he aſſures his Apoſtles, they ſhould be hated of all men for his Names ſake, and that the time would ſoon come, when whoſoever killed them ſhould think, (as the Cruſadoes and their Military Saint *Dominic* no doubt thought) they did God ſervice. It's ſufficient to our preſent purpoſe, that we ſhew ſome who held with us againſt the preſent Doctrine of the Papacy.

But here I expect their uſual Objection: That many of the Writers and Perſons we alledg did not in all things agree with the Proteſtants, though in ſome particulars they conſented.

True, no more did they in all things agree with the preſent *Roman* Church. If ſome who believed not the Popes Supremacy, the Sacrifice of Chriſt in the Maſs, Merits, Purgatory, *&c.* were yet Members as of the Catholick, ſo *Roman* Church and were ſaved (which I ſuppoſe no Papiſt will deny:) Why are we Proteſtants condemn'd as Hereticks to Hell for believing as ſome of their Infallible Popes, and Canonized Saints have done? I challenge any Papiſt to ſhew me one National or Provincial Church (I might go farther) in the whole World, that for at leaſt twelve hundred years after Chriſt, did in all points believe as the *Trent* Council have decreed; or profeſſed that Catholick Religion, which Pope *Pius* hath ſumm'd up in his Creed: We may ask them, Where was your *Tridentine* Faith and Church before *Luther*? Was Pope *Leo* the Great for receiving the Communion in one kind? Was Pope *Gregory* the Great for worſhipping of Images, or for that proud, profane, Antichriſtian and fooliſh name (as he calls it) of *Univerſal Biſhop*? Were *Cyprian*, Saint *Auſtin*, the Council of *Chalcedon*, the *African* Biſhops for Appeals to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and ſubjecting all Churches to the Popes Univerſal juriſdiction? Were

Were theſe *Tridentine* Papiſts? Was *P. Gelaſius* for Tranſubſtantiation? *Were they* in all things agreeing with our preſent *Roman* Catholicks? Who hath ſo hard a forehead as to affirm it, or ſo ſoft a head as to believe it?

I ſhall onely add, That it is no wonder, if many good Men and learned did not at once ſee and diſcover in an Age wherein Ignorance and Superſtition abounded, all theſe Errours, Abuſes, and corruptions which infected the Church of God, but did in ſome things, not altogether ſo groſs and palpably wicked as others, *errare errorem ſeculi. follow the current of the times.*

To end, I hope Sir, by what hath been ſaid, you plainly perceive that thoſe Doctrines and Practices Proteſtants have rejected, were never any part of the true, Primitive and Catholick Faith contained in the Scriptures or the Writings of the Antient Fathers and Councils. Yea, that in the later, and as is confeſſed, worſt Ages of the Church, were never received and viſibly profeſſed by all true Catholicks, whether of the *Grecian* or *Roman* Communion. The moſt and beſt that can be ſaid, is, that at firſt ſome of them were the private Sentiments, and doubtful Opinions of ſome Worthy Men; as Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, *&c.* in the fourth or fifth Century: Which after many Ages by the Policy and Power of the Pope and his Party were obtruded by the Councils of *Lateran*, *Conſtance*, *Florence*, *Trent*, &c. as Articles of Faith, on this *Weſtern* part of the World, but not without viſible oppoſition and open contradiction. I have ſhewn how multitudes of learned and pious Men did complain of them, and write againſt them; and others, as the *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes*, forced by violence and perſecution ſeparated themſelves, (as the Orthodox Chriſtians did under the prevalence of the *Arians*) actually and perſonally from them, beſides others who cordially, yet for fear of perſecution more privately and ſecretly, *i. e.* in ſome ſenſe or degree inviſibly renounced and deteſted them.

See *Brerewoods* Enquiries.

I ſhall here add, that indeed this is more than we are in reaſon bound to ſhew; for it was ſufficient to prove the perpetual exiſtence or viſibility of the Catholick Church,

and to denominate the *Roman* a true, though corrupt, part or member of it, that ſhe profeſſed the fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith contained in the Apoſtolick, *Nicene*, *Athanaſian* Creeds, although ſhe ſuperadded, as Hay and Stubble thereunto many additional or traditional Points and erroneous practices, whereby conſequentially the foundation of Faith was much ſhaken and undermined; yet ſo, as ſome amongſt them not erring wilfully, upon a general repentance might be ſaved, yet ſo *as by fire*, i. e. with much danger and difficulty. However, undeniable it is, that many Eminent Writers and Profeſſors in the Ages before *Luther* never owned them as Theological truths, much leſs Articles of Faith, but viſibly, openly and couragiouſly reſiſted them, even unto bloud. Theſe, and not the Popiſh domineering Party (termed by ſome the Court rather than the Church of *Rome*) were, as the perſecuted Catholicks under *Liberius* and the *Arian* Emperours, in the ſtrict and moſt proper ſenſe the true, viſible, Catholick Church, which remained diſcernible, though more obſcurely, in *firmiſſimis ſuis membris*, as Saint *Auſtin* ſpeaketh, *in theſe her moſt firm and invincible members*. Others who maintained, promoted and tyranically impoſed theſe Errours as points of Faith, were in reſpect of theſe introduced corruptions like an impoſtumated Wen, growing by little and little on the body of the Church, or like a Gangrene, or Leproſie ſpreading it ſelf by degrees over it; the cutting of this Wen, the curing this Gangrene, the cleanſing and removing this Leproſie, our Adverſaries moſt unreaſonably and abſurdly condemn, as deſtroying the antient Catholick Faith and ſetting up a new Church under the Banner of *Luther*; which we deteſt and abhor. Contrarily we, not they, contend earneſtly for the antient true Catholick Faith once and once for all, delivered to the Saints, in oppoſition to their late ſubintroduced Novelties of Tranſubſtantiation, Image-worſhip, Purgatory, *&c.* which, as we ſee by Pope *Pius* his new Creed, they will needs add as Articles of the Antient, Primitive and Catholick Faith, to the *Nicene* Creed, neceſſarily to be believed and profeſſed by all Chriſtians under peril of Hereſie and Damnation. If the Pope and Church of *Rome* may make

V. Auguſtin. de Baptiſmo contra Donatiſt. l. 1. c. 8. & 10.

B. *Uſher's* Serm. before King *James* of the Unity of Faith.

Auguſt. Epiſt. *ad Vincent.*

make as many Articles of Faith as they please; surely in time we may have a Creed as large as *Aquinas* his Sum. I shall only add my earnest Prayer, that God would enlighten you with his Holy Spirit that you may see the truth, and renouncing all secular ends and private interests, cordially embrace it, in regard (as an Antient Father long since said,) It becometh not wise Men rashly to give up themselves to their Fathers Customs, but to endeavour to find out the Truth. *Amen.*

Theodoret de curand. Græcor. affect. Serm. 1.

Your faithful Friend.

FINIS.

Books lately printed for James Adamson.

I. A Treatise of the Celibacy of the Clergy, wherein its Rise and Progress are Historically considered. In *Quarto.*

II. A Treatise proving Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, writ by *Reginald Peacock*, Bishop of *Chicheſter*, before the Reformation, about the Year 1450.

III. Doubts concerning the *Roman Infallibility*: 1. Whether the Church of *Rome* believe it. 2. Whether Jesus Christ or his Apostles ever Recommended it. 3. Whether the Primitive Church Knew or Used that way of Deciding Controversies.

IV. The Salvation of Protestants asserted and defended, in Opposition to the Rash and Uncharitable Sentence of their Eternal Damnation pronounced against them by the *Romish* Church; by *J. H. Dalhusius*, Inspector of the Churches, in the County of *Weeden*, upon the *Rhine*, &c.

V. The present State of the Controversie between the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*: or an account of the Books written on both sides, in a Letter to a Friend. In *Quarto.*

VI. Two Discourses of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead. In *Quarto.*

VII. *Clementis epistolæ duæ ad Corinthios. Interpretibus Patricio Junio, Gothofredo, Vendelino, & Joh. Bapt. Cotelerio. Recensuit & notarum spicilegium adjecit Paulus Colomesius, bibliothecæ Lambethanæ curator; accedit Tho. Brunonis Windsoriensis dissertatio de Therapeutis, Philonis. His subnexæ sunt Epistolæ aliquot singulares, vel nunc primum editæ, vel non ita facile obviæ.* In Quarto.

VIII. *Pauli Colomesii Observationes sacræ, Editio secunda, auctior & emendatior; accedunt ejusdem Paralipomena, de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, & passio sancti Victoris Massilienſis, ab eodem emendata, editio quarta & ultima longe auctior & emendatior.* Octavo.

IX. The Travels of *Monsieur de Thevenot* into the *Levant*, in three Parts, *viz.* 1. Into *Turky*, 2. *Persia*, 3. The *East-Indies.* In *Folio.*

A brief Historical Account of the Behaviour of the *Jesuits* and their Faction for the first twenty five Years of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, with an Epistle of *W. Watson* a Secular Priest; shewing how they were thought of by other *Romanists* of that time. *Quarto.*

The Argument of Mr. *Peter de la Martelliere* Advocate in the Court and Parliament of *Paris*, made in Parliament in the Chambers thereof being assembled, *An. Dom.* 1611. for the Rector and University of *Paris*, Defendants and Opponents, against the *Jesuits* Demandants, and requiring the Approbation of the Lectors Patent which they had obtained, giving them power to read and to teach publickly in the aforesaid University, translated out of the *French* Copy, set forth by publick Authority, and printed at *London* 1612. *Quarto.*